

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN a difficult sentence at the end of Acts 18 we read that Apollos had been instructed in the way of the Lord, and that he was an enthusiastic and accurate teacher of the things concerning Jesus, though he knew no baptism but that of John. In the next chapter we are told of disciples in Ephesus, who were in some sense believers, but who had been baptized only with John's baptism. Again, in Jn 1²⁰, the reiterated denial by John that he was the Messiah, suggests that the claim of Messiahship had been made for him. From all this it seems a natural inference that the Baptist movement was far more widespread and long-continued, perhaps even a more serious rival of Christianity, than we would gather from the Synoptic Gospels.

We are accustomed to accept as a matter of course the choice by John of the river Jordan as the scene of his baptisms. Yet historically the Jordan did not play that part in Jewish purificatory ceremonial which the Ganges has played in the religious life of the Hindus. Sir George Adam Smith describes the river as a groove at the bottom of an old sea-bed, flanked by ugly mud-banks, with dead driftwood everywhere in sight, sweeping its way to the Dead Sea through unhealthy jungle, relieved only by poisonous soil. We are not surprised, then, to be told in *The Gnostic John the Baptizer*, by Mr. G. R. S. MEAD (Watkins; 5s.).—Mr. MEAD at this point is following Dr. Robert

Eisler—that in those days the brackish waters of the sluggish Jordan were by theologians and ritualists deemed unfit for purificatory purposes.

Why, then, did John baptize in the Jordan? Mr. MEAD finds the answer in the vision of Ezk 47¹⁻⁸. 'In the longed-for time of the Messianic deliverance a mighty stream of holy water from the temple-hill of Zion was to flow down and heal the waters of the unclean Jordan-land, the Arabah or Desert.' Surely a much more obvious explanation is that of Sir George Adam Smith, that the Baptist had in mind the closing scene in the life of Elijah, his great prototype, and the message of Elisha to Naaman.

In the former scene 'the river that had drawn back at a nation's feet, parted at the stroke of one man,' and Elijah handed on the torch to his successor, as John recognized in Jesus his successor and supplanter. Even more relevant is the story of Elisha, who, so far as the Scripture records go, was the first to use the Jordan for sacramental purposes; just as, so far as we know, he was the last to do so till the Baptist arose.

But this precedent sheds a new light on the meaning of the Baptist's mission. Naaman was not merely a leper, but a Gentile. Moreover, Jewish baptism was for proselytes from the Gentile world. When, then, John called on Israelites to repent and

be baptized, he was in effect asking them to recognize that as a nation they had lost their birthright, and were no longer a privileged people. God was able of these stones (Aram. *'ab'nayya*) to raise (or wake) up children (Aram. *b'nayya*) for Abraham.

Besides the Gospels, another source of information about the Baptist is the famous passage in the *Antiquities* of Josephus, in which he is represented as a great preacher of righteousness, whose sayings (*logoi*) made him the idol of the people, and who used the rite of baptism, not 'as a begging-off in respect to certain sins, but for purity of body, in as much as indeed the soul had already been purified by righteousness.' According to Josephus, Herod put John to death to forestall any revolutionary tendencies that might develop.

Dr. Eisler's view, then, is that John was a Torah man, a profound student of the Law and the Prophets, that his movement was a characteristic movement of Jewish reform, founded on absolute faith in the present fulfilment of prior prophecy. Herod, on the other hand, thought of John as a potential politician. The Mandæan tradition has a third view of John, that he was a Gnostic, expelled from the Jewish community by men who failed to understand him.

The word Manda means 'gnosis,' and the Mandæans of the lower Euphrates, a community still said to number about ten thousand souls, are the only surviving representatives of the ancient Gnosis or mystic knowledge. In his article on the subject in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, the late W. Brandt tells us that this interesting people was first made known to Europe by Portuguese monks, and that their language is the form of Aramaic that developed in Lower Babylonia. This language is now practically reserved for their sacred books, their spoken language being Arabic, or in some cases Persian.

One of these sacred books, known as the Book of John, deals largely with the life and teachings of

John the Baptizer. The tractate seems to have been for a time largely ignored by the community, but in later times they turned to the figure of the Baptist with intense interest. In the extracts here translated into English from the German translation of Professor Lidzbarski (who is continuing his work on the Mandæan literature), John, the exponent of a mystic Gnosticism, seems very far away from the simple downright prophet of the Gospels.

Portents attended the child John's birth, and the priests saw dreams. The birth was miraculous in another sense than that of the gospel story, for the heavenly messengers took 'the child out of the basin of Jordan and laid him in the womb of Enish-bai.' In all this we hear echoes of the gospel story; and his self-conscious demand: 'Who makes proclamations equal to my proclamations, and who doth discourse with my wondrous voice?' may be a reminiscence of the testimony of Jesus to the Baptist.

The Gnostic John was an ascetic. Not only wine and women, but even sweet savours and scents were powerless to make him forget his Lord; and the birds assured him: 'Thou hast set thyself free, and won thy release, and set up thy throne for thee in life's House.' He was invulnerable, too, to fire and sword.

In one scene Jesus Christ is represented as asking baptism from John as a pupil of his. John refuses, and accuses Jesus of lying to the Jews, deceiving the priests, and relaxing the Mosaic Sabbath legislation. Jesus replies lengthily in true Gnostic style; and finally, in obedience to a Letter from the House of Abathur, John baptizes 'the Deceiver' in the Jordan. Then Ruha (the This-World-Mother) makes herself like a dove and throws a cross over the Jordan. In all this the connexion with the gospel story is obvious; it is equally obvious that the Mandæans were in no sense Christians, though they may at times have pretended to be Christians in order to escape Muhammadan persecution.

Further extracts tell of the breach between the Mandæans and the Jews, of the exiled community settling on the Euphrates, of the persecution of the Mandæans by the Jews and their attempts to make them return. It may well be, as Mr. MEAD claims, that the literature of this interesting people, especially when fuller translations are available, as they will soon be, will throw valuable light on Christian origins. One illustration which the author gives is not very convincing.

It is well known that in early times the fish was used as a symbol of Christianity. The explanation usually given is that the letters of the Greek word for fish form the initial letters of the Greek words for 'Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour.' The author thinks it has been established that 'fish' was quite a common Rabbinic symbol for the righteous man in Israel, 'who lived all his life in the waters of the Torah.' One of the Mandæan passages quoted in the John-Book is a saga of 'The Fisher of Souls.' But even if we grant that Rabbis and Gnostics had a fish symbolism, independently of Jesus, surely the author of the Gospel parables needed no help from such a traditional symbolism in the coining of His memorable phrase 'fishers of men.'

It has been truly said that every man is born either a Platonist or an Aristotelian. And as it is in philosophy, so it is in politics: every child—as a famous couplet reminds us—is born either a Liberal or a Conservative. The recent emergence of a political party with another name does not alter this fundamental cleavage, for its actuating principle is just an emphatic extension of Liberalism. And as it is in philosophy and politics, so it is in religion and theology: for here, too, we have our conservatives and our liberals—those who look back to the past and who tend to rest in it, if not to worship it, and those who press on to the future.

More or less is this true of all religions. It is notoriously true of Christianity: the fierce battle

at present being waged in America between Fundamentalism and theological progress is the pathetic witness to the cleavage to-day. But it is no less true of Judaism. Orthodox Judaism has been confronted and challenged for over a hundred years by Reform Judaism. Indeed, the challenge is older still, it is as old as the Old Testament, where priest and prophet stood as often face to face as back to back—the priest conserving the past with its institutionalism, the prophet challenging the present in the name of the kingdom of the spirit, and by his fearless criticism laying the foundations of a future in which the mind of man could move untrammelled and free.

In a pamphlet noticed elsewhere in this number, Rabbi H. G. ENELow defines the distinction, so far as it concerns Judaism, in these terms: 'Orthodoxy regards Judaism as fixed, immutable in every particle, settled once for all. Reform regards Judaism as mobile, subject to change and adaptation, correlated with the diverse conditions of successive ages.' To Maimonides, the Torah is an everlasting commandment, without change, deduction, or addition; to Geiger, Judaism is the result of a process of development. Can any one who knows anything of the history of Old Testament thought doubt that Geiger is right?

Reform Judaism maintains, as the Rabbi reminds us, that 'there has been no such thing as a uniform, stationary, unalterable Judaism, whether in point of belief or practice.' Between the primitive Judaism of pre-Canaanite times and the Judaism, say, of the period of Ezra, though there is doubtless a real continuity, it is surely obvious that there is a whole world of difference. Deborah would hardly have been at home among the thoughts that breathe through Is 53, and the wildest imagination could hardly permit itself to conceive of David as having penned Ps 139. Everywhere there is movement, and the thought moves *pari passu* with the history. Only the most impossible and outrageous harmonistic would attempt to combine, as of equal validity, thoughts so essentially diverse

and even conflicting as meet us everywhere in the historical books, the law, and the prophets.

It has even been maintained that the name of Israel's God, 'Jahweh,' suggests by its very etymology the necessity of a progressive conception of religion. 'I will be what I will be' has been taken to imply not a static but a dynamic idea—the idea that Jahweh will always be found to be equal to every emergency which the future may throw up, whether on the field of thought or of history. Or, as Sir George Adam Smith has well put it, 'Jahweh was never discredited by any new conception of truth or by any strange experience in their history. Every fresh moral ideal is confessed by the people as the impression of His character and will; and for each new problem raised by their contact with the world their faith in Him is found sufficient.'

Theology, then, if it is to be true to the Bible, must fear any conservatism which involves rigidity, and it must boldly recapture its right to liberty and movement. 'Christ has made us completely free'—as Weymouth translates Gal 5¹—'stand fast, then, and do not again be hampered with the yoke of slavery.' How often does the Bible admonish us to *walk* in His ways! Advance is not possible without movement. It is hardly straining a point to notice that this very word 'walk' is used of God Himself. The suggestive promise of Lv 26¹² runs, 'I will *walk* among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people.' Where God and His servants walk, there is movement and life, alike in thought and action: immobility is death.

The claim made by Reform Judaism for liberty of movement and adaptation must be made with equal strenuousness by all intelligent Protestants who take their Protestantism seriously. It is, strictly speaking, a mistake to identify Protestantism with a particular belief or set of beliefs or institutions; rather is it an attitude, a spirit. 'One might say,' remarks Frederic Myers, 'that the characteristics of Protestantism lie rather in

the maintenance of the spirit of freedom, than in the profession of any definite peculiarities, either doctrinal or ecclesiastical.' Protestantism is the spirit that is ever ready to challenge all that obscures the truth, whether that be the teaching and traditions of an ancient church, the solemn decisions of ecclesiastical councils, the authoritative decrees of Popes, or even the traditions which in its own name have been established.

The true man is both conservative and liberal: he gladly conserves from the past whatever has proved its worth, whatever has in the olden time sustained the souls of men; and he freely accords a generous welcome to any new truth that can show its right to be believed and that can commend itself to his unfettered reason. Of course both tendencies have their dangers as well as their excellences: conservatism may degenerate into rigidity and liberty into licence.

It is hard to say which is the more perilous. But we cannot forget that it was conservatism that nailed our Lord to His cross; and the history of theological thought furnishes only too abundant proof that conservatism has often made men ungenerous and unjust to other men who loved truth as they loved their lives. Reverence for the past should not and need not blind us to the obligation to express truth in terms of the thought of our own day, nor should it be permitted to cast a blight upon the spirit of adventure: for where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

For some time there has been proceeding in the Church of England a welcome revival of a liberal evangelical spirit. More than six hundred clergy are said to belong to the movement. The aim of its leaders is to 'formulate the evangelical message anew for the age in which they live.' To this end more than fifty pamphlets have been issued, dealing with the Christian faith in relation to Theology, Sociology, and Science. A more sustained ex-

position of 'Liberal Evangelicalism' appeared two years ago and has passed through four editions. Now a second volume of essays is published, under the title of *The Inner Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net).

The volume consists of fourteen essays by well-known teachers of the Church of England. It is no miscellaneous collection, but a well-considered and well-compacted whole. It would not be easy to name a more satisfactory statement of the liberal evangelical position. It may be that the centrality of the Cross is not emphasized as Evangelicals have been wont to emphasize it, but the passionate devotion of the writers to Jesus Christ, as God Incarnate and the Saviour of the world, is manifest. One of the most striking of the essays is by the Rev. E. S. Woods, M.A., well known for his masterly book on 'Everyday Religion.' It deals with Christ our Example, and a slight outline of it may be given.

It is the peculiar glory of Christianity not merely to set up a lofty ethical ideal but to provide the means to its attainment, 'to say, not simply you *must*, but you *can*, and to show how that "can" may become an accomplished fact. And Christianity achieves this by laying emphasis not so much on a standard to be reached or an example to be copied, as on a life to be shared.' In approaching this life two points are emphasized. First we are on firm ground historically. 'The battle of the documents has by now been fought out to what is, from the Christian point of view, a victorious conclusion.' Second, it was a real human life. In accepting Him as God Incarnate we at the same time affirm that Jesus was genuinely and really man. Otherwise it is meaningless to speak of Him as our example.

In seeking to penetrate to the inner springs of His life we must not be content with a study of His virtues one by one. We must go deeper, for the most arresting thing about Him is the spiritual climate in which He lived, the sort of ultimate

attitude of soul, the quality of spirit, which made not only possible but inevitable the words which He spake and the things which He did. 'When Jairus' servants met Him with the news that the little girl was dead and that therefore it was useless for Him to go any farther, what strikes one is less the bare record of what He proceeded to do, amazing though that is, than the implied state of His own mind—the utter buoyant certainty that death itself was conquerable and would be conquered.'

This spiritual climate was the result of unclouded communion with God. 'To Jesus God was everything. For Him, in every circumstance, God came first; not as one of the factors in the situation, but as the supreme factor which determined the nature of every thought, every motive, every decision, every relationship.' This was not intellectual certainty but genuine faith, not ready made but won and held in the face of unbelieving men and of blackest circumstance. It was a faith active and infinitely daring. 'Once He saw clearly that a certain course of action, or a certain needed benefit, was really good, that is, was completely in line with what His Father willed, He did not stay to consider whether or no it was, as we should say, possible (that is, "intelligibly attested by previous experience"), but straight away made His claim upon God, and God *responded*.'

The other great secret of His inner life was His attitude towards men. It is difficult for us in any adequate way to appraise what He felt towards other people. 'Think of love as we know it at its very best and highest: the tender, protecting love of a mother for her child, the wise and understanding love of a father for his grown-up son, the happy, easy, taken-for-granted love of brothers and sisters, the rich comradeship of friends, the glorious, selfless, if need be forgiving, love of man and woman, the redeeming love of him who goes to spend his life with and for the outcasts and the poor—take all this, and blend it and see it filling the heart of, and ever pouring forth from, a single human personality, and then we shall perhaps

realize something of the way in which Jesus regarded His fellow-men.' This love did not come easily; He won it as He won His faith in God. What He felt about God naturally and inevitably determined what He felt about men, for He always saw them in God. And He learnt to love them in the same way as He knew that His Father loved them. 'Perhaps this is the greatest thing about Him, that He went on loving them even when they thought Him a fool or a madman; yes, even when they betrayed Him and spat on Him and crucified Him.'

One thing remains to be said. It is that Jesus Christ evidently entertained a deep-rooted conviction that what He felt about God and about man

should be and could be the normal way of thinking for ordinary men. So He set out on the task of helping men to share His certainty of God and to treat one another in a way that befits members of the great family of a Father-God. Thus there is imported a rich and wonderful meaning into the phrase 'Christ our Example.' 'That phrase ceases to be, what many phrases heard in church actually are, touched with unreality. It is just sheer truth to say that there is no reason in the nature of things why the writer and the readers of these lines, and any other quite ordinary people, should not be "made like unto Jesus," provided, of course, that the one condition be fulfilled, that of humble, continued, conscious personal contact between Him and us.'

Religious Education in the Day School.

BY THE REVEREND FREDERICK J. RAE, M.A., DIRECTOR OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION,
TRAINING CENTRE, ABERDEEN.

In any treatment of this subject there are two points that obviously call for discussion. One is the place of the religious element in the school curriculum. The other is the training of those who are to be responsible for this particular task.

1. *The Place of Religious Education in the School.*—There are special reasons to-day why this question should be faced. There are all kinds of influences militating against the religious factor in education. It is not a grant-earning subject in the 'public' elementary school. The day is already so crowded with compulsory subjects that there is a great temptation to push the Scripture lesson aside. And teachers have, in addition, one reasonable excuse for this. They have been trained for their job generally, but this is the one thing in their job they have not been specially trained to do. There are other reasons. But the ones mentioned are sufficiently serious. And the fact that they have not really displaced the Bible lesson, and that (at least in Scotland) it is given on the whole with great faithfulness and care, only goes to show how loyal our teachers are to the best ideals of their calling. All the same, the current running

against us is so strong that a brief statement on the point may be excused, more especially as some practical considerations follow from our conviction.

The fundamental place of religion in the day school is clear, first of all, from the nature of education itself. Education is not instruction. It is the development of personality. It is the discipline under which a child grows to be what (and all) he is capable of being. But this means the growth of the whole personality; not one element in it. To develop the body at the expense of the mind and to develop the mind at the expense of the body are equally serious errors educationally. Now the place of religion in this discipline depends on your view of what man is naturally. If he is a 'child of wrath,' wholly inclined to evil and wholly incapable of good, no amount of 'developing' will make him a religious being. But if (as I believe) he is naturally religious, if there is a Divine element in him, a spark of the Infinite, if, in short, we are made in the image of God and are therefore naturally children of God, at least in the sense of being 'His offspring,' then education is the developing of *this* as well as of mind and body. It is the process

in which the soul grows up to the stature of a full faith and a knowledge of God. I know that the 'new Psychology' denies the existence of a religious instinct. But the denial is merely verbal. There are few religious minds that do not acknowledge that we are born with a 'religious nature.' Man is inherently and incurably religious. He has been so all over the world and in all ages. And that seems to show that the religious element in man is not only persistent but profound. It is fundamental in his being. And if this is so it must be clear that the same place must be occupied by religion in the discipline that enables man to grow to his full capacity. My point is that, fundamentally, man is a religious being, and that to neglect, or give a second place to, the religious factor in his education is to do him a real injury. A mere secular training has no right to the name of education if man has a religious nature.

There is another reason for the basal place of religion in general education. It is that religious belief is the necessary and the only foundation of ethics. It is sometimes unreflectingly said that it does not matter what a man believes, it is his life that matters. But a little thought shows that what a man believes is the *only* thing that matters. Because we all live for what we believe in. If I live for money, it is because I believe it is the best thing in the world. If I am a 'worldling,' it is because I believe pleasure is the best thing. A man's conduct *always* follows his real belief. But, apart from that, men, speaking generally, need a sufficient sanction for moral conduct. Why should I be good? There is a final reason if goodness is in the nature of things, that is, in God. But if we cannot appeal to any such sanction, what constraining reason can be found for goodness? My excuse for this brief excursion into elementary philosophy is that it is the reason why so many of the best and most experienced educationists object to lessons on morals in the school, apart from religion. They hold rightly that religion is the necessary background and basis of all moral teaching.

If, then, it be conceded on these two grounds alone, that religion must have not only a place but a fundamental place in the school curriculum, it seems to me there are one or two practical results of this conclusion. One is that the religious lesson ought to be given by the class teacher and not by a specialist. The idea of training specialists is a

very attractive one at first sight. And (unless my memory deceives me) the C.O.P.E.C. Report on education advocates this measure. That, however, would be not only a mistake but a disaster. If religion is the foundation of any true education, why take it out of the hands of the person who gives that education? This teacher is here to train the child and help him to grow to a true manhood. Yet we propose to remove from him the part of the discipline which is most important. Moreover, it is during the religious lesson, if at any time, that the teacher has the best opportunity of establishing that relation of affectionate trust on which his whole influence depends. He has then his greatest chance of influencing the child's nature and of letting what is best in himself find expression. It may be urged that, on the one hand, the ordinary teacher is not fitted by training to give the religious lesson, especially in view of modern science and criticism. To which the complete answer is: 'Fit him. You are not training your teacher for his business if you leave this out.' On the other hand, it may be said that some teachers cannot conscientiously give the religious lesson because they are without religious faith. 'It is much better to give this business into the hands of a specialist than to have it done by a man without faith.' Of course that is true. I have heard of a teacher who, after a Bible lesson, said to his class, 'That is what the ministers teach. But I don't believe a word of it.' A situation which allows of such an outburst is intolerable. But there are not many teachers without a religious faith. And there would be fewer still if in their training was included a term of Christian apologetics during which the students in training were allowed to discuss freely with the lecturer any religious difficulties that were troubling them. But if a teacher could not conscientiously give this lesson he ought to be excused from it without in any way being penalized for his disability. At the same time it ought to be recognized as a misfortune debarring him from his greatest privilege and his most precious opportunity as a teacher.

Another point of some importance is that if religious education is the development of the 'soul' or religious nature, then it is truth and not facts which the teacher has to impart. Probably the most serious defect in the teaching of this subject in the day school at the present time is that we have so much instruction and so little

education. The Scripture narrative is taught excellently. That is to say, the history and biography in it are well taught. The *facts* are imparted faithfully. But that is not religious education. It is only at that point religious education begins. The facts are the instruments the teacher uses. At the risk of misunderstanding I would say the facts are of secondary importance. It is the truth of a narrative that matters. Take an example of what is meant from the New Testament. The teacher's task, from one point of view, is to send good citizens out of the school. Well, among the truths the New Testament insists on are two which are the necessary condition of good citizenship, namely, brotherhood, and service, instead of gain, as a motive in life. These are not 'natural' truths. We are not naturally brothers, nor do we live instinctively to serve instead of to gain. These are truths that come from Christianity. But a teacher who uses the New Testament rightly will impress them on his pupils. It is these truths and not merely the 'facts' of a story, or even of the life of Jesus, that the teacher has to impart. His aim is to help the child to grow to his best—as a citizen, but not only as a citizen—as a man also; and as a child of God. This is why religious education in the day school is so important, and why it differs so radically from religious instruction. It may be important for a child to know the names of the kings of Israel and Judah. I do not know them, and never did. But it is far more important for the child to know how God revealed Himself during that period of history. It may, or may not, be important for a child to be able to trace the course of St. Paul's journeys. But it is vital that in studying St. Paul's life he should be enabled to see what utter devotion to Christ is, and how great a service to humanity such a life renders.

If I may refer to one other application of the same point before passing on, I may suggest that there is some comfort in it for teachers who have serious difficulty about the teaching of Old Testament miracles. The teacher is repeatedly faced by the question, when handling a narrative, 'Is this true?' I venture to suggest that the question is not so urgent as it sounds. We have to remember that the view of history which prevailed in ancient times was not that which is dominant to-day. Our age has seen the birth of the scientific view of history, according to which meticulous accuracy is one essential qualification of a historian. That

was not the ancient view. The ancient aim was homiletic. The Bible historian was more concerned with the meaning of events than with the details of their happening. I do not mean that accuracy was of no account, but that it was secondary. His concern was to show how God was in the event. God taught by words and by deeds. History shows the unfolding of His will and purpose. And the main significance of history is what it reveals of God's dealings with men. A certain event may happen (like the death of Uzzah). To the Bible historian it is not an event merely, it is a judgment of God. This view dominates the whole Old Testament. And it is a relief to the teacher to realize that the miraculous in an event is often the interpretation which the writer places upon it. My point is that in actual teaching this is a real help. It is the truth in an event, the permanent significance of it, the moral or spiritual lesson in it, that we have to convey to the child. We are only following the ancient historian when we thus deal with his narratives. Because the main medium of religious education is truth, not fact, or rather truth through the fact and in the fact, therein our task is rendered easier.

I may, greatly daring, venture to add one other conclusion. Real religious education can never be 'examined' or inspected. You can examine instruction, you can test the child's knowledge of facts, of Bible history and geography, but you cannot examine or test the development of 'the soul,' which is the one proper objective of religious education. The more successful a teacher is in this high task, the less his work can be measured. Some sort of supervision is, I suppose, essential, as human nature goes. But how happy we should be if we had teachers with the real objective ever before their eyes and left to themselves to carry it out!

2. *The Training of Teachers.*—It is obvious that, if the aim of religious education be what I have described, we must prepare the teachers for this high task. There are two reasons of special importance, and I will glance at them in turn.

(1) One is the influence of the teacher's personality. 'It all depends on the Teacher,' writes Professor Burkitt. 'No regulations, no schedule, no prescribed methods will make Bible teaching profitable if the Teacher is not good enough.' And he adds of his own experience at Harrow under Bowen: 'Perhaps, after all, it was not

because the Scripture lesson was taught by the Form-master, but because the Form-master was Bowen, that the lesson was so good.' What is true of all teaching is, above all, true of religious teaching, that it is personality that tells. It is personality that propagates itself. What gets over to the child is what the teacher is and has in himself—his faith, his character, his affection. I remember the two teachers who influenced me most at school. One spent his Saturday forenoons teaching us to swim. The other, a reserved kind of man, asked me to stay behind one hour for a talk, and told me that the masters had been talking about me and had concluded I could do better if I tried! That was all, but it was enough to turn me into a worker. I indulge in these personal reminiscences to point my representation that, in a subject where especially personality gets its opportunity more than in any other, the teacher's own spiritual possessions are what matter. This is clear enough in the matter of character. A bad-tempered teacher will have little influence in the religious lesson. A sarcastic teacher will have even less. A master whose habits are known to the children to be bad may leave a very dark stain on the life of the school. But what I am thinking of is more the teacher's own personal religion. This is a vital point. If a teacher is without this, how can he train the soul of the child in the knowledge of God? This is so vital that it should be made an integral part of the teacher's preparation. But how? The only definite suggestion I have to offer is one that is the result of personal experience. In the Scottish 'Training Centres,' where all the teachers for the schools in Scotland (except Roman Catholic and Episcopalian schools) are trained, there are Directors of Religious Instruction, whose task it is to give students in training a complete course of instruction in religious essentials. Part of this course is what may be called Introduction to the Bible, and deals with questions like Inspiration, and all that a teacher should know about the Bible, its authority, and its general contents. Another part deals with Methods, the right way to teach the Bible, the difficulties met with, and so on. A third part consists of Christian Apologetic, and in this part the students are encouraged to suggest the questions to be discussed. They, for the most part, take full advantage of this, and the points submitted are discussed freely and frankly on the floor of the class, questions and interruptions being

invited and frequently offered. This is perhaps one of the most valuable features of the students' preparation, for it secures that no student need leave a training centre without the opportunity of having his religious difficulties faced in open discussion. So far as this goes, then, some help may be given to teachers in the attainment of a religious point of view.

(2) Another reason for the careful preparation of teachers is the serious difficulties that face them in the task of religious education. One of these is the uncertainty that is widespread at the present time in regard to the authority of Holy Scripture. There is everywhere a vague uneasiness. 'Can we trust the Bible any longer? Has not Science demolished much of it? And has not Criticism rendered the foundations of our old belief insecure?' That is the kind of feeling that is in the air. And even if teachers have no first-hand knowledge of criticism, they feel in handling the Bible like a man fighting with one hand tied behind his back. Are the Fundamentalists right? Or are the critics right? Where do we stand? It is clear that teachers in our schools who have to use the Bible ought to have this whole question of the nature of the Bible and of its inspiration and authority frankly faced. They ought to be familiar with the real facts so that they may see that the authority of the Bible is of such a kind that no discoveries of science or conclusions of criticism can affect it one whit. The teacher ought to be able to go to his work with complete confidence in the Bible. Otherwise he cannot use it effectively. I have referred to the Bible view of history and how the knowledge of this may help the teacher. Another example of the same kind is the importance to be attached to the fact that Revelation is a growth. I say 'importance,' and I mean 'all-importance,' for the truth of the Progressiveness of Revelation is the key to most of the difficulties of the Biblical narrative. A teacher has to deal with the story of the destruction of Jericho. He reads that God ordered the complete extermination of the inhabitants—men, women, and children. Having just read the Parable of the Prodigal Son, he revolts against the suggestion that God could give such a command. He is certain God never did give it. How is he, then, to explain the clear statement of the narrative, and how did it come about that the narrator imagined God to have given it? Clearly because his conception of God was imper-

fect, and because at that time the total destruction of enemies was regarded as a right measure to take, and, if right, then divinely sponsored. The earlier parts of the Old Testament are full of stories which reveal a crude morality and a very primitive idea of God's character. There is no difficulty whatever about all this to a teacher who has grasped the truth of the Progressiveness of Revelation, and also the fact that the Bible is the record of this progressive revelation. Dr. Percival, a former headmaster of Clifton College, used to teach his boys this truth plainly and steadily. The result of his teaching was rather surprising. At the English Universities it was noticed that the only boys who never had any difficulties about the Bible were the Clifton College boys. The difficulties did not arise. They did not exist. For the simple reason that the boys had a conception of revelation to which the fact of crude morality and imperfect ideas of God presented no difficulty at all. But those who are going to be teachers must receive thorough instruction in all this. In a Scottish school last year a lesson was given which included the death of Uzzah. At the end of the lesson a child said to the teacher: 'Did God really do that to Uzzah for touching the Ark? Wasn't it cruel of Him?' To which natural question the teacher replied: 'We must just accept it because it is in the Bible.' With the best intentions that teacher was doing what she could to create a sceptic. How very simply such a story is explained by the truth of the Progressiveness of Revelation. And scores of other incidents in the same way. Our task to-day is to reveal the infinite treasure we have in the Bible, and to help the children to see in the Bible the Word of God. But we dare not teach the children anything which is contradicted by actual knowledge outside the Bible. And we cannot teach on the basis of a theory of Biblical inspiration which is outworn. We have to take the Bible as it is. Its history is not the mere happening of events but the web of God's purpose, and to the Bible historian the meaning in the history is more than the happening. The 'science' of the Bible is the science of the day. Here again the tradition is simply a medium of the revelation of truth. The old traditions are sometimes legends, sometimes myths, sometimes poetry. There is a great deal of sound accurate history in the Old Testament. But there is also a good deal of tradition of which the detail cannot

be accurate. And the record is the record of a process through which God is progressively known in His nature and His will. We can only preserve the Bible as the Word of God when we see that a word is a channel by means of which truth is conveyed. This channel is what it is. We might wish it to be different. The Fundamentals insists that it *is* different, that it is inerrant and perfect in its statements of fact. Demonstrably this view is erroneous. But it is this view that creates all the difficulties. There are no difficulties if you take the Bible as it is. There is no difficulty in accepting it as the Word of God if you take it as it is.

I do not urge that teachers should be turned into experts in criticism. But they should have a general knowledge of the broad, sound conclusion of a sane criticism. The 'Higher Criticism' in the hands of some of its representatives sometime goes to absurd lengths. It splits up narrative and assigns phrases to this and the other imaginary 'redactor' until we read in bewilderment that about six writers were concerned in putting a story into shape, all of them identifiable. This is criticism run to seed. But there are sound general facts which criticism has brought out which are often a help to a teacher. It is a fact that there are parallel narratives of the same event in the historical books. And the plain contradictions in the story can often be very simply explained when you see that the discrepant statements come from narratives which were written at very different times. In this way a general training in the principles and simple results of criticism is of immense help to the teacher.

Finally, in view of possible misunderstanding, let me explain that I do not suggest the impartation of these mental processes to the children, at least to children of immature years. What I am aiming at is the giving to the teacher a *point of view*. He must see what the Bible is and on what ground its authority rests before he can teach it effectively. He must know all about it before he can love it and he must love it before he can teach it. When the teacher has reached a satisfying view of the Bible he will share this unconsciously with his pupils without saying anything at all about inspiration or authority. The standpoint from which he teaches will insensibly communicate itself to his pupils, and they will grow up with a reasonable view of the Bible implied in all they think about it.

In this article I have dealt with what, I am convinced, are the two most important points in connection with religious education in the day school. But I should like to pay a tribute to the help afforded to teachers by the two writers of the articles which have preceded mine. *Old Testament Stories and How to Teach Them*, by Mr. Basil Kedlich, should be in every teacher's library. I

hope the second part of it, which is eagerly awaited, will not be long delayed. *The Child's Knowledge of God*, by Mr. Grigg-Smith, though more general, is of immense value, and contains a great deal of help in the matters on which I have touched in the foregoing pages. Both books are full of the kind of enlightening inspiration which makes the Bible a new and wonderful book.

Literature.

JESUS AND THE GREEKS.

ONE of the most keenly debated questions connected with the early Church is the extent to which Christianity almost from the outset was transformed by Greek influences. In *Jesus and the Greeks; or, Early Christianity in the Tideway of Hellenism*, we have a discussion of the whole subject, under the competent guidance of the Rev. William Fairweather, M.A., D.D., of Kirkcaldy (T. & T. Clark; 2s.). As Dr. Fairweather says, times have changed since the days when Dean Prideaux could speak of a roaster as 'this famous impostor,' and could say of him and Muhammad, 'Both of them were very crafty knaves,' while similar epithets were applied to the Buddha and to Confucius. The pendulum has swung to the other extreme, and it is necessary now for the apologete to prove that Christianity was not simply an adaptation of ideas of the Mystery religions made by fitting the figure of Jesus into popular schemes of thought. The discussion centres largely round the question of the independence of Paul's thinking, or rather his indebtedness to Jesus rather than to the Mystery religions.

The first section deals with the world-wide diffusion of Hellenistic culture during and after the time of Alexander the Great; a second section treats of Philo; while the concluding part discusses the whole question of the relation of Hellenism to early Christianity and the New Testament. Dr. Fairweather analyses Hellenism and finds it in certain important respects a preparation for Christianity. He thinks Greek philosophy paved the way for the gospel by demonstrating the inadequacy of the human reason to formulate a satis-

factory doctrine of God and of salvation; in his estimate of Stoicism he differs from Dr. Glover, who claims that at least the later Stoicism was a religion and even a gospel. In the important discussion of Philo, the author points out that Philo's conception of the Logos is really an amalgam of the Stoic thought of the Divine reason actively operating in the world, the Platonic doctrine of Ideas, Alexandrian Wisdom, the Wisdom of the Old Testament, and the Memra of Palestinian Judaism. That it is such a composite explains both our difficulty in giving a systematic account of it and the extraordinary influence it had on later doctrinal systems. It is a mistake to make the Logos idea of the Fourth Gospel depend wholly on the Old Testament or wholly on Philo. Philo had popularized a certain conception of the Logos which was largely influenced by the Jewish Wisdom Literature. 'John' took over the term and transformed it; for example, the doctrine that 'the Word became flesh' would have been repugnant to him. The influence of Philo on the Epistle to the Hebrews is well known; the author finds also many Philonic parallels in Paul's writings and some in James.

Dr. Fairweather recognizes that Paul was acquainted with Stoicism, not only with its phraseology, but probably also with its main doctrines.

The fact, however, that Paul employed the Stoic ethical vocabulary does not mean that it was from the Stoics he derived his ethics or his philosophy. On the whole subject of Hellenic influence Dr. Fairweather adopts a conservative attitude. Early Christianity was essentially independent. Hellenism was polytheistic; to the Christian God is one. In Hellenism man seeks God; in Christianity God

seeks man. Stoicism was materialistic, pantheistic, determinist; for the Christian, 'Your heavenly Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him.' Seneca approached the Christian position as to a future life, though, speaking generally, the Stoic attitude was ambiguous. Stoicism, with no consistent view of moral evil, thinks it can be purified by physical means. To Christianity sin is not a necessity of the world's constitution, but an element of disorder which must be dealt with by a Redeemer.

This thoughtful and scholarly book by one who writes with such authority as Dr. Fairweather is a timely contribution to the study of Christian origins.

ETHICS OF INDIA.

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins is unhappy, not without cause. He has devoted his life to teaching us Westerners with rare skill about the other faiths, and is still forced to see that 'apart from some erroneous familiarity with India's religions there is little known in this country of what the Hindus have thought and said,' and nothing at all about their ethics. And in truth he is not the only one who has sat 'dejectedly' listening to much confident nonsense from the pulpit. Yet Professor Hopkins must admit that the fault lies not a little with the scholars. Does he not acknowledge that when he started out to write his *Ethics of India* (Milford; 14s. net) he believed that he was the first in an untrodden field, though he discovered that Professor M'Kenzie was ahead of him by a few months? Of that work he speaks always with respect, but with a certain genial criticism of its tone and outlook. His own book carries one away by its sheer interest. And it is over great waters that one voyages, and at rich lands that one touches, and a vessel laden with a royal cargo that puts into port at last. This is a full book, written in the right spirit, never fulsome, always sane and balanced, openly critical at places (is there not a shrewd chapter upon Ethical Aberrations?), yet by one who is frankly happy to discover how far his fellow-men have seen, and how high some of them have climbed, and what a wealth of stars shone down on them even in what we take to have been dark and chilly nights. Indeed, in a last chapter, in which he compares the Hindu Ethics with our own, he is quite clear that in some

ways they have a wider sweep than ours, and there at least in no way lag behind.

Perhaps as illuminating a little study as one can meet upon the Upanishads is to be found here. Again, a fascinating section of the work is that upon Buddhist Ethics, though there one has the feeling he is less friendly than usual, and rather blackening the shadows. Everywhere as one reads it is borne in on the mind, half pathetically and half proudly, how very long it is since men defined human duty loftily; saw that life is meant to be a straight road, that old, old, ever-recurring metaphor, 'a knife edge of a path to heaven,' how difficult to keep; dreamed of a 'going home' at last, where, says the great Epic, 'there is neither hunger, nor thirst, nor weariness, nor age, nor sin'; and strained to that, some of them, with all their strength and soul. And their difficulties were our difficulties, and their problems were our problems; and to them too, thank God, light enough struggled through to let them see the way, a way how steep and far and hard; yes, but a way that climbed and lured men up.

MANCHESTER, 1925.

The World Task of the Christian Church (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net) contains, with two notable exceptions mentioned below, the principal addresses delivered at the Conference on International and Missionary Questions held at Manchester in January of this year. The addresses are the work of recognized leaders of Christian thought and authorities on missionary and social problems. The aim of these quadrennial conferences is to present to each student generation the world-situation in the light of the Christian gospel. This high aim 'Manchester' admirably fulfilled. The speakers were no easy optimists. They do not minimize the immensity and complexity of the problems awaiting solution. In some respects they give an appalling view of the present outlook, but they do not fail to point out the path of hope. If the present troubles are due to the intensity of group consciousness, leading to the creation of hostile groups—industrial, national, racial—the only hope of salvation for the world lies in the emergence of another group which shall unite the members of all the hostile groups, shall bridge the gulfs between them and conserve the values for which each is standing. This redeeming group must be united

by religious faith, for all our human problems are at bottom spiritual and moral. It must find its rallying centre in Jesus Christ and draw its power from His living Spirit. He must be the Alpha and Omega, for it is the Divine purpose to sum up all things in Him. Therefore the aim of His people must be the assertion of His Lordship over the whole life of man.

At the Conference two remarkable sets of addresses were given by Christian leaders of distinction, whose work might well have been published in one volume, as setting forth man's spiritual need and the answer to that need which is given in Christ. The Student Christian Movement, however, has seen fit to publish them separately.

The first is entitled *The God Man Craves* (1s. net), and is a comparative study of some non-Christian conceptions of God, by Principal A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D. In his three lectures Dr. Garvie deals successively with Confucian and Buddhist conceptions, Brahmanic and Hindu conceptions, and Islamic conceptions, showing how the best elements in these point beyond themselves and find their realization in Christ.

The second set of addresses was delivered by the Bishop of Manchester on *Christ's Revelation of God* (1s. 6d. net). The subjects treated are, What our Lord presupposed, What our Lord taught by speech, and What our Lord taught by action. No attempt is made to argue or to deal formally with difficulties. The addresses are rather of the nature of a manifesto—clear, orderly, compact, and illuminating. For any one in search of a brief reliable exposition of what Christ stands for nothing more satisfactory than these addresses could be suggested.

HERMES TRISMEGISTUS.

In these days when authors and publishers alike are tempted to decide their undertaking of a book by the question, will it sell? it is pleasant to find that a large work of pure scholarship which is unlikely to make a popular appeal, is still forthcoming. The number likely to be interested in Hermes Trismegistus is not large. Those who will purchase for private use four volumes on the subject at a price—if we may judge from the first—of 30s. net, is still smaller. All the more cordially do we congratulate Mr. Scott and his publishers on this very fine and courageous undertaking.

Who was Hermes Trismegistus? Well, there was 'no such person.' A number of devout philosophical thinkers in Egypt on the one hand, and some writers on astrology, magic, and alchemy on the other, had their teachings issued pseudonymously under what was taken to be a venerable and authoritative name. For in the last resort Hermes Trismegistus was just the god Thoth, who taught Pythagoras, who taught Plato, who taught the anonymous lecturers whose discourses are preserved as *Hermetica*. It would not be worth while for any one to spend a long time in editing the pseudoscientific *Hermetica*. The religious and philosophical *libelli*, however, possess great interest, and to them Mr. Scott devotes himself.

He is engaged on a veritable *magnum opus*, of which only the first instalment is before us—*Hermetica: The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings which contain certain Religious or Philosophic Teachings ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus*, edited, with English Translation and Notes, by Mr. Walter Scott: volume i., Introduction, Texts and Translation (Clarendon Press; 30s. net). The three other volumes promised are to embrace a Commentary (two volumes) and Testimoniae, Appendices, and Indices.

The writings here translated consist of 'Corpus Hermeticum,' the Latin 'Asclepius,' 'Stobæi Hermetica,' and 'Fragmenta' found quoted in ecclesiastical writers such as Lactantius. The translation is fluent and idiomatic, suggestive of Jowett's Plato. Where the text is corrupt or defective, Mr. Scott's emendations are most happy. The textual criticism reveals scholarship of the first water. So does the informative and most interesting Introduction.

It is quite clear that in the main the Hermetists were Platonists with a dash of Stoicism, touched with the heightened religious fervour which they drew from Egypt. In contrast to the adherents of the Mystery-cults they are not sacramentarians. In contrast to the Gnostics they have no authoritative 'Scripture.' Plato, especially in *Timæus*, is undoubtedly their great master. Traces of Jewish influence are slight, of indisputable Christian influence, non-existent. Yet, as Mr. Scott points out, they may have exercised considerable influence on the Christian Church. Their activity was at its height probably early in the third century A.D., and so their sons or grandsons, although they made no direct import of teaching into Christian doctrine,

did so indirectly by betaking *themselves* to the Church. Hence the *Hermetica* may not be without importance for the development of Alexandrine theology. 'In that sense,' says Mr. Scott, 'it may be said that in the *Hermetica* we get a glimpse into one of the many workshops in which Christianity was made.'

We shall look forward with eager interest to the appearing of the subsequent volumes of this great work.

BIBLICAL LEXICOGRAPHY.

It is often charged against the critics of the Old Testament that they show too little regard for the Massoretic Text, and are too ready with needless attempts to amend it. Those who cherish a secret respect for the Text as it stands will be strongly encouraged by the efforts of Dr. Israel Eitan, in his *Contribution to Biblical Lexicography* (Milford; 10s. 6d. net), to explain it without recourse to emendation. He discusses many difficult passages, especially from the Books of Job and Proverbs, and shows that the key to certain baffling words is to be found, occasionally in Ethiopic, but very frequently in Arabic. There can be no doubt that many of his suggestions are eminently worthy of consideration. He renders, for example, the perplexing clause in Ec 3¹⁸, thus: 'truly God has created them (לָבָרָם) = (א) + בר (א) = Afab. *la*, "truly") to show that they are stupid like beasts' (הם in שָׁחָם being *stupidity*, and connected with the Arabic *hāma*, 'to run about madly'). No real student of the Hebrew text should miss this book. It is a pity that the proof-reading has been rather inadequate: note on p. 6 linguistical, occasoin; on p. 13 parrallel; on p. 15 Steinfdrorff; on p. 23 isloated; on p. 39 adjectdive, wicknedness; on p. 60 atrificial.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC.

An excellent piece of theological work has been done by the Dean of Divinity of St. Mary Magdalen College in Oxford. He was asked to give a course of four lectures at the General Theological Seminary, New York, and the result will be found in *The Place of Reason in Christian Apologetics*, by the Rev. Leonard Hodgson, M.A. (Blackwell; 5s. net). The author is a little long in getting into his stride, but when he does 'get going' there is no dubiety about his direction or the ground he

covers. His general thesis may be said to be that there is no sufficient ground for apologetic, either generally religious or specifically Christian, except in reason. Subjective experience is not sufficient in either case. It is not enough because you cannot distinguish it from the subjective experience of other religions, at least in any final fashion. A religious experience is only validated if regarded in the light of a general religious belief arrived at on grounds of reason. And so with a Christian experience. The writer also considers the claims of Otto's own famous argument from the 'numinous' experience and comes to an unfavourable verdict. The last of the four lectures contains an application of these principles to one actual case, the Person of Christ. Mr. Hodgson shows how in regard to the Christian central affirmation reason and experience weave an argument which is satisfying to heart and mind alike. This is a book of considerable value and great interest. It is pleasant to hear that the writer intends to devote himself to the further development of his argument and to its application in other directions.

CAPITALISM.

A reasoned and detailed attack upon the present capitalistic system is made in *Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times*, by Mr. Thorstein Veblen (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). The title is peculiar, but the writer defines 'Absentee Ownership' as the ownership of means in excess of what the owner can make use of, personally and without help. The line of cleavage in society to-day runs not between those who own something and those who own nothing, but between those who own more than they can personally use and those who have urgent use for more than they own. The conventional contrast between Socialism and Anti-Socialism is obsolete in face of the new alignment of economic forces. The real question is about the use of national resources. The interest of the 'underlying population' (who are deprived by absentee ownership) lies in the maximum output at low cost, whereas the interest of the owners of industry is served by a moderate output at an enhanced price. The argument takes a wide sweep and includes a review of economic history, both here and in America, and an examination of the nature of business and industry. The book is a very able one. It is perhaps not so immediately

impressive as Mr. Sidney Webb's recent indictment of Capitalism. But so good a judge as Mr. J. A. Hobson pronounces it 'the most formidable attack upon Capitalism ever delivered.' This will at any rate help to secure for it a fair consideration.

THE BUSHONGO.

The administration of the vast region of the Belgian Congo has no longer the evil repute under the present King of the Belgians which it had during the later years of the reign of his predecessor. A more enlightened and civilizing system of government is gradually making headway against the century-old native customs of cannibalism, slavery, and heathen superstition. The Congo and its many tributaries have become the hunting ground not only of those in search of big game, but of the explorer and the anthropologist. Among the last named class Mr. E. Torday, a member of the Council of the Royal Anthropological Institute, has travelled over a vast area from the mouth of the Congo to its head waters in the Lualaba, discovered by Livingstone and later traversed by Stanley. Of the most important phases of his journeys Mr. Torday has now published a very full narrative entitled *On the Trail of the Bushongo* (Seeley, Service; 21s. net). This is a remarkable and hitherto unknown African tribe among whom the author lived for a considerable time, thus gaining an intimate knowledge of their early history, their religious beliefs, form of government, manners and mode of life. They believe in a Supreme Being, 'but consider Him an immaterial essence too high above all that is human to interfere with individuals.' This is Mr. Torday's interpretation of their belief. He describes the Bushongo as 'undoubtedly the greatest artists of black Africa; as weavers, embroiderers, carvers in wood and as workers of metal they have not their equals in the whole continent.' Great respect is paid to those who excel in their craft, and everybody without distinction of class strives for proficiency in one craft or another. Surely a native race of which civilization ought to make much in the immediate future.

1923, delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne. The writer modestly describes his lectures as 'the work of a bishop of a rough country diocese, whose life is mostly spent in train, motor-car or buggy, and who is deeply conscious of their defects and of their indebtedness to the inspiration of others. They were written at odd times and in odd places, in railway stations, in trains and in the homes of many Gippsland hosts, rarely, indeed, amidst the conveniences of the study.' Thus criticism is effectually disarmed. None the less these lectures make exceedingly fresh and interesting reading. They are eminently practical, and rich with the experiences of a man who is in the work with heart and hand. The place of the evangelist in the Church, his ministry and his message, the duty of the Church itself as an evangelizing agency, and the presentation of the Evangel, are fully and adequately dealt with. Altogether this is a book which cannot fail to be useful and inspiring to any one who would 'do the work of an evangelist.'

To all who are interested in *What Jesus Read*, the Rev. Thomas Walker, D.D., has done a useful service by writing the book to which he has given that name (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net). It is essentially an abbreviated version of the book he published not long ago on 'The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age,' of which it gives the substance without the learned apparatus which accompanies it. One part deals with the dependence of Jesus on the Jewish books, and thought of His age, and this enables Dr. Walker, in the succeeding section, to bring into striking contrast with it the independence of Jesus. It is an ingenious way of doing justice both to Jesus and to Judaism. The great religious merits of Judaism, often grudgingly or inadequately admitted by Christian scholars, are fully recognized—there is no cheap or shallow attempt to depreciate them, and the originality of Jesus becomes all the more indubitable. It is an impartial discussion with interesting and fruitful results.

Evangelism in the Australian Church, by the Rev. George Harvard Cranswick, D.D. (Angus & Robertson; 6s.), is the Moorhouse Lectures for

The Case for the Central Powers (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) is an impeachment of the Versailles Verdict by Count Max Montgelas. As Count Montgelas was co-editor of the German documents relating to the outbreak of the War, his book may be regarded as authoritative from their point of view. It contains a carefully compiled account

of events leading up to the crisis of 1914, with a minutely detailed narrative of the diplomatic exchange of views immediately preceding the outbreak of war. It is highly important that the English student of history should have these documents and statements laid before him. The general reader, however, will be apt to find them somewhat wearisome, and public opinion is not likely to be greatly influenced by meticulous details of what passed in the fateful hours and minutes at the close of July 1914.

The Hundred and Twentieth Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society is a very bulky volume. It is a wonderful record calculated to have the best influence upon the pessimist. The Bible or some part of it has now been translated into five hundred and sixty-six languages spoken by our fellow-subjects of the British Empire. The Society's issues for the year ended 31st March 1924 were eight and a half million copies. Only in five previous years during the Society's existence has it circulated more Bibles. Over 100,000 more English Bibles and 6000 more Welsh Bibles were issued. The Rev. Dr. Kilgour, Editorial Superintendent, states that the outstanding feature in the editorial department has been the issue of complete New Testaments for the first time in no fewer than nine languages.

Those who desire to see the work of the Society treated in a more attractive and popular form than in a statistical Report will find it in a pamphlet of less than a hundred pages entitled *Like Unto Heaven*.

The authorship of Dr. Burkitt is ample guarantee of the quality and value of a book. *The Religion of the Manichees* (Donnellan Lectures for 1924), by the Rev. F. C. Burkitt, Hon. D.D. (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net), is admirably done. The reader may be assured that here he is put in possession of all that is at present known concerning that syncretism which for a time claimed the adherence of the great St. Augustine, and exercised for long a wide influence.

Immigrants and their Influence in the Lake Region of Central Africa, by the Rev. John Roscoe, M.A. (Cambridge University Press; 2s. net), is the second Fraser Lecture in Social Anthropology, delivered in 1923. The lecturer, who has special

knowledge of the Uganda Protectorate, gives a brief but interesting account of the social and religious customs of the successive races which have occupied the country.

We have received a new cheap edition, revised and enlarged, of *The Purpose of Education*, by Mr. St. George Lane Fox Pitt (Cambridge University Press; 4s. net). The last two editions appeared with an appendix. The substance of this appendix, together with some further additions, is now embodied in the text.

Much in the spirit of Mr. Montefiore, Rabbi H. G. Enelow offers a fine discussion of *The Theoretical Foundation of Reform Judaism* (reprinted from Yearbook, vol. xxxiv., Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1924). He shows that Reform Judaism has a genuine theoretical basis, and that basis is the religious teaching of the prophets. It is the sworn foe of an immobile and stagnant tradition, it correlates itself with the changing conditions of successive ages, but through all changes its permanent and essential element lies in certain great ethical and spiritual affirmations enunciated by the prophets—affirmations concerning the righteousness of God and His demand for righteousness on the part of men.

In *The Significance of the Agada* (reprinted from Yearbook, vol. xxiv., Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1914) the same Rabbi presents a sympathetic and attractive picture of the Agada (or Haggada) which will be as welcome to Christian as to Jewish readers. Its aims, he tells us, are the spiritual enlightenment, the ethical education, and the moral fortification of the people; and its methods and forms are of infinite variety—legend, fable, parable, proverb, saws; nothing human is alien to it. The Rabbi conclusively shows that the Agadists are the true successors of the prophets and the poets of the Old Testament. There is much that is quaint, even perhaps puerile, in their exegesis, but much also that is profound and original, as when, to illustrate the fellow-suffering of the Holy One with Israel, Is 40¹ is made to suggest that, when the Sanctuary was destroyed, the Lord Himself needed to be comforted. 'Comfort Me, comfort Me, O My people.' Several interesting excerpts are quoted at considerable length, which let the uninitiated see what the Agada

really is, and how genial, human, and attractive it can be.

Questions at the Cross, by Mr. E. Middleton Weaver (Epworth Press; 1s. net), is an admirable treatment of a great theme. The questions treated are, Why is the Cross central? Why was the Cross necessary? How does the Cross save? and Is the Cross true to experience? The writer's aim is to 'meet actual difficulties presented by Christian people, and especially young people, who know that they have been redeemed, and are experiencing real fellowship with God through Jesus Christ, but who cannot think helpfully of Calvary through the symbols of Hebrew ritual or in the terms of Roman jurisprudence.' The treatment is simple and free from the technical terms of theology. It should prove most helpful to earnest young people in the churches who desire wise guidance in their thinking about the Cross.

Dr. Frank Ballard has long been recognized as a Christian apologist of the highest standing. Many, therefore, will welcome a booklet from his pen on *Christian Truth concerning the Lord's Supper* (Epworth Press; 1s. net). It is written in the interest of Christian union, and deals mainly with the valid observance of the Supper, especially in regard to the ministrant. Needless to say, Dr. Ballard repudiates High Church theories, and argues for the simple practice of the Apostolic Church as revealed in the New Testament.

The Reunion of Christendom (Griffiths; 2s. net) is the second of a series of booklets edited by the Rev. J. H. Burn and entitled 'Addresses on Great Subjects.' Nine short sermons are included in the present booklet—good average sermons, but giving no sustained and adequate treatment of the important subject with which they deal. No doubt the cost of printing has greatly increased, but the price charged here for forty-eight pages loosely bound in paper is apt to strike the reader as alarmingly high.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published a popular edition of *The Fact of Christ* (3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, D.D., Professor of Church History in Westminster College, Cambridge.

The Inner Circle, by the Rev. Trevor H. Davies, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), is a series of studies of some of the first disciples and associates of Jesus. These were delivered in substance as sermons to the writer's congregation in Toronto, and they are in effect a volume of popular sermons. As such they are excellent. If somewhat discursive they are interesting, scriptural, and full of sound Christian teaching. The writer has a fine gift of imagination and a considerable skill in character painting, and he draws his illustrations from a wide knowledge of modern literature. The general reader will find the book charming, and the hard-pressed preacher will be sure to discover something in it to replenish his store.

Science and Creation, by the Right Rev. C. F. D'Arcy, D.D. (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), is a little book of quite exceptional freshness and value. It is the writer's conviction that 'the modern scientific way of viewing the history of the world, instead of creating difficulties for Christian thought, not only gets rid of problems which were found insoluble by the theologians of the past, but affords fresh reason for the essential doctrines of the Christian Faith.' This thesis he maintains with great power and attractiveness of statement. His chapters on the Epic of Creation and the Mystery of Life present the most recent findings of science in a nobly imaginative way, and the writer builds on them an impressive argument for the truth of the Christian faith. This is a book that will bear re-reading, for the reasoning is closely knit and every page is packed with good things.

The Psychological Approach to Religion, by the Rev. W. R. Matthews, D.D. (Longmans; 3s. net), contains three lectures dealing with the relation of Psychology to the great subjects of Belief in God, Conversion, and Immortality. The lectures, though brief, are clear and informing; the statements made are careful and well weighed; and the relation of Christian belief to recent psychological investigation is lucidly set forth.

Reviews and Studies, by the Rev. F. J. Badcock, D.D. (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net), consists of a number of papers, most of which have appeared in various theological magazines. They have rightly been deemed worthy of being preserved in more permanent form. The subjects treated are biblical

and doctrinal, such as, to name a few, the Trinity, Modernism, the Transfiguration, the Gospel Miracles, the Cult of the Reserved Sacrament. There is a remarkably full and valuable study of Christ as Seer. In spite of the diversity of matter there is a unity of view-point and harmony of treatment which make the collection an organized whole. And the matter is of the very highest quality.

Outlines of Meditations and Sermons for every day of the month, two from the Morning and two from the Evening Psalms, will be found in *Outlines on the Book of Psalms*, by the Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D. (Longmans; 9s. net). The aim of the book is to facilitate the use of the Psalms in private devotions, and to aid the clergy in their preparation of sermons on the Psalms. There are in it not a few allusions to patristic literature, but there is practically no recognition of the important critical work which has for long been lavished on the Psalter. The latter part of Ps 19, e.g., is believed to be by David, Pss 42 f. were written by him when he was fleeing from Absalom, and Ps 23 when he was a shepherd boy. From such an unhistorical approach to the Psalter we shall not look for much exegetical light. Dr. Mortimer's standpoint is sufficiently indicated by his remark that the king's daughter in Ps 45 is the Church. As meditations the book may serve a useful enough purpose for those who have no interest in scientific exegesis.

The Rev. J. Russell Howden, B.D., is an admirable exponent of the Keswick school of doctrine. *A Man's Foes* (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d.) gives a careful and Scriptural analysis of that trinity of evil, the World, the Flesh, and the Devil, and points the way to spiritual victory. Perhaps the writer tends at times to bring more doctrine out of a text than it really contains, but his expositions are sound and helpful in the highest degree.

The Scottish Church and University Almanac (Macniven & Wallace; 2s. 6d. net) for the present year contains all the usual information taken from the official records of the Church of Scotland, the United Free and the Free Churches of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church of England, the Episcopal, Congregational, Baptist and Wesleyan Churches in Scotland, the provincial Training Colleges for Teachers and the four Scottish Universities.

A second edition, revised and enlarged, has been issued of *Baptism*, by the Rev. Robert Middleton (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net). It is an answer to the contentions of the Baptists in regard to Immersion and Pædobaptism. The style is popular, and the argument is none the less effective for being spiced with a certain amount of gentle railery.

In spite of all our modern scholarship, it is amazing how much of the world's classics has never been translated into English. How little of Attâr, the great Sufi poet, whom his mighty successor Jalâl-ud-din called 'the Soul itself,' is yet in our hands. His Colloquy of the Birds has been available in French for sixty years, but even yet it is not to be had in English. Here, however, is an abridged version—*The Conference of the Birds*, by Mr. R. P. Masani, M.A. (Milford; 6s. net)—of the famous Sufi allegory. There is an introduction of forty-six pages upon Persian Mysticism, which is no doubt necessary for the general reader, and as appendix a brief sketch of Attâr's life. But this leaves only seventy pages for extracts from the poem itself, a disappointingly meagre allowance. It is, of course, another picture of the long hard road that lies before a soul that dares to set out on the great adventure, a road that winds its slow way through the seven dreary terrifying valleys. And here again is the old warning. For, of the millions that set out, only thirty, and these worn and spent, attain the goal, to find that they have solved 'the enigma of I and Thou' and have themselves become Him whom they sought. This is a fine introduction to a great Mystic classic.

The Methodist Year Book, 1925, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, contains the official record of all the activities of that most influential religious organization. There is information in it for every pastor, Sunday school teacher, and for every man who is just a plain layman. It contains in its earlier pages portraits of 'Methodism's New Bishops.' They are all notably young men. They wear no distinctive garb, not so much as the clerical collar familiar in this country. There is an uncompromising declaration adopted by the General Conference entitled 'Methodism's Crusade for Peace.' 'War is not inevitable,' it says. 'It is the supreme enemy of mankind. Its futility is

beyond question. Its continuance is the suicide of civilization. We are determined to outlaw the whole war system.'

As part of a plan to write an encyclopædia of Mediæval Jewish Philosophy, Dr. Israel Efros presents, in the form of a vocabulary, the *Philosophical Terms in the Moreh Nebukim* (Milford; 12s. 6d. net). The terms are translated, and sometimes more or less elaborately explained, with occasional allusions to their Arabic or Greek equivalents. To students who are working on this difficult and unfamiliar field the material here provided will be invaluable.

A most delightful and valuable work is *An Episode in the Struggle for Religious Freedom—the Sectaries of Nuremberg, 1524-1528*, by Mr. Austin Patterson Evans, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Columbia University (Milford; 12s. 6d. net). The author unfolds the problem which speedily emerged on the principles of the Reformation, the perplexity occasioned to Luther by the unexpected discovery that every one did not find in Scripture exactly what he himself did. How the question worked itself out in Germany in the sixteenth century is a very instructive study, and Dr. Evans is a most capable exponent.

An admirable paper on *The Philosophy of History*, written for the British Academy by Professor A. S. Pringle-Pattison, is published by Mr. Humphrey Milford (1s. net). It is quite what we should expect from its distinguished writer.

A second edition of *The Theory of Good and Evil*, by Dr. Hastings Rashdall (Milford; 2 vols., 18s. net), has been published. The first edition was published in 1907. The second edition is practically a reprint of the first, but certain corrections, mostly verbal, are incorporated from a copy marked by the author.

Palm Sunday to Pentecost (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net) is a reprint with but few alterations of the concluding part of 'A Gospel Monogram,' by Sir William J. Herschel, Bt., M.A., first published in 1811. It contains the gospel records of the Passion, Death, and Resurrection of our Lord. On the left hand page the texts of the four Gospels are arranged in parallel columns, on the right hand

page is the 'Monogram,' a skilful dovetailing together of the various narratives.

Texts illustrating Ancient Ruler-Worship, edited by Professor C. Lattey, S.J., M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 6d. net), is in size a mere pamphlet of two dozen pages. Yet it is an interesting little work of reference, being the Greek and Latin texts on the subject from Homer and Æschylus downwards, thus marking the impetus which such worship received in the days of Alexander the Great; and so on through Republican Rome, the Roman Emperors, the Jews and their Rulers, and ending with the famous passages in the Martyrdom of Polycarp and Pliny's Letter to Trajan. A handy little book.

Professor E. Allison Peers, M.A., is rapidly heaping up benefits upon us. It is only a few months since we were given a fine book on Spanish Mysticism; and not much more since he translated into English for the first time Ramón Lull's 'Book of the Lover and the Beloved.' On that occasion he promised us some more of that fascinating figure's writings. And here already we have his *The Art of Contemplation* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). It is a more difficult book than the other, and Professor Peers plainly ranks it lower. Yet all may not agree in that. This is 'a practical manual, a text-book of method'; its aim is 'to teach men to love, to teach men to pray.' In its rapt musings on such central matters as the Divine Essence it wades in so far that great tides sweep us off our feet, and the dark grows very dark for some of us at times. Yet there are passages that dimly recall great pages in the Confessions; and others in which will and understanding and memory prompt each other by question and answer to yet more intense devotion, that have a queer thrill in them. Though it is true that here and there throughout the book there is a sense of strain, and that a thin impalpable mist lies over most of it.

The importance of historical fact for the validity of Christian beliefs is the theme of *Christianity and History*, by the Rev. F. W. Butler, Vicar of Brizenorton (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net). It is a closely reasoned essay which is not afraid of very deep waters. We feel that the preliminaries rather dwarf the main point, so that the cogency of the

conclusion is not apparent at the first glance. But it is not a book to glance through.

Mexico in Revolution, by Mrs. Charlotte Cameron, O.B.E., F.R.G.S. (Seeley, Service; 21s. net) is a vivid account of an Englishwoman's experiences and adventures in the land of revolution, with a description of the people, the beauties of the country and the highly interesting remains of Aztec civilization. Mrs. Cameron is an experienced traveller, and she has the true story-teller's gift. Without any pretensions to fine style she contrives to present a living picture of the things she sees and the people she meets. She has also a measure of the historic imagination which makes the past live again, and so her narrative is touched with the ancient glamour of Cortez and Montezuma. In contrast to that we find ourselves amid the grim horrors of present-day revolution of which the writer had her daily share. Altogether this is a most readable book.

The Old Religion in the New Age, by the Rev. G. P. Symonds, B.A. (Skeffington; 3s. 6d. net), contains some score of addresses by one who was a chaplain during the War. They make pleasant reading and are most Christian in intention, if not strong intellectually. They belong to a type of sermon frequently delivered during wartime, but now little heard. Germany is still the dragon, and the cause of the Allies is without qualification identified with the Kingdom of God. This gives the book a somewhat antiquated flavour, and one feels that the world's malady needs a deeper probing and a more radical cure than is here presented. The book would have profited here and there by more careful editing. 'People do not go to Church and Chapel to-day like they went when you and I were boys and girls,' seems a curious sentence to address to ex-service men, and the announcement that 'there is still a debt of £60 on the memorial' cannot possibly be of interest to the reader who does not know what memorial is referred to.

Silent unto the Lord (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net) contains a series of meditations arranged by Constance M. Whishaw. These meditations consist wholly of brief extracts from religious writers arranged under appropriate headings. The selection is made with taste and care and shows wide reading,

Man and God, by Louisa C. Poore (Stock; 4s. 6d. net), first published in 1920, now appears in a second edition. There are four additional chapters.

Christ the Carpenter and His Trade in His Teaching, by the Rev. Ira Boseley (Stockwell; 3s. net), is sufficiently described in its title. The author has gathered with devout care into this little book all references to carpentry in the teaching of Jesus. The number of these is surprisingly large, though some may seem somewhat far-fetched. The subject is treated in a direct and simple fashion and illuminated with many touches of imagination.

The Path of Discipleship, by Muriel G. E. Harris (S.C.M.; 4s. net), is cast in the form of letters to a young girl friend. The letters have the right ring about them and read as if they were part of a real correspondence. They are affectionate, interesting, vivid, and to the point. They treat of such subjects as Courage, Patience, Temptation, and the like. All are brought to the touchstone of the Cross, and the writer emphasizes the reality of the companionship and help of the living Christ. The counsels given are most wise and good, and are eminently fitted to reveal the joy and brightness of the Christian life. No better book could be placed in the hands of a young girl.

Highways of the Spirit, ii. Prayers (S.C.M.; 2s. net), is an anthology of Bible prayers. It is intended to be a companion to a larger book previously published and bearing the same title, and it follows the same general sequence of subjects. The larger contains readings for meditation, this for prayer. Both are entirely Biblical.

The Theology of the Real, by Mr. R. Gordon Milburn (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net), is a book of the gad-fly order—provocative in the best sense. Mr. Milburn tries to get down to bed-rock, eschewing all 'isms' and doctrines until a real situation has been studied. We do not expect that he will command general assent. In such a chapter as that dealing with sex problems we should be sorry if he did. At least, however, he always makes us see what are the real problems to which too often we are apt to shut our eyes. The book, we must add, is written throughout in a most charming and interesting style.

The Son of Man: Origin and Uses of the Title.

BY THE REVEREND J. COURTENAY JAMES, M.A., B.D., BOURNEMOUTH.

THE word בֶּן, 'son,' is used in many relations in the Hebrew of the O.T. This subject is itself full of interest, and merits detailed study. The only term to which attention is called here is בֶּן־אָדָם, בֶּן־אָנוּשׁ (poetical), בֶּן־אָנִישׁ (Aram.), 'son of man.' It may be remarked that בֶּן, Ps 2¹², should not be rendered 'son.' This word did not belong to the classical language and is found only in late Hebrew. It is true that the loftier poetical dialect of Hebrew had some phases in common with Aramaic. This partly explains why the higher style of O.T. composition exhibits archaic words, which were no longer in general use. No doubt some non-Hebrew terms and idioms were handed down from those primitive times when Hebrew clans stood in closer relation to some Aramæan tribes. It is possible that both בֶּן and בִּר are from the same root בָּנָה, 'to build,' and that it is a case of the liquids נ and ר simply interchanging. The form בִּר in the second Psalm is best regarded as the Hebrew for 'purity,' as in the phrase בִּיר לֵב, 'pure of heart' (Ps 73¹). The verb יָשַׁע has other meanings besides 'to kiss' (e.g. Gn 41⁴⁰, Ezk 3¹³), hence the Targum rendering 'receive instruction,' the LXX διαξάσθε παιδείας, and the Vulgate *apprehendite disciplinam* (with these the Arabic and Ethiopic Versions agree). A further preliminary remark may be added on the distinction between אָדָם and אָנוּשׁ. The former probably means 'blood-coloured,' and is related to אָרָמָה, 'ground,' hence 'earth-born'; the latter is from the root אָנִישׁ, 'weak,' 'sick,' hence 'frail man'; this word is mostly poetical.

The appellation 'Son of man' in the case of our Lord Jesus Christ is unique and suggestive. The literature on the subject is considerable, often inconclusive and sometimes obscure. Holtzmann's study (*N.T. Theol.* i. 246 ff.), though invaluable in some respects, is open to this criticism. One of the best, most independent, erudite, and lucid works is that of Fiebig (*Der Menschensohn*), who gives much attention to the Aramaic phase of the problem. A summary re-setting of the subject,

with perhaps one or two fresh suggestions, may be opportune. The data are so scanty that no definite conclusion can be based on a study of a supposed original Aramaic. The phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is not found in Greek authors, and would mislead a pure Grecian. The term υἱὸς Θεοῦ is found in inscriptions of the Græco-Roman period as a title of Augustus, and is equal to the *divi filius* in Latin inscriptions (cf. Deissmann, *B.S.*² 166 f.). But υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου is never so found as a title. These facts indicate that, while some appellative and technical expressions of the Imperial age may have been transferred to Christ, the title 'Son of man' did not come from this source. The title, no doubt, had its origin in Semitic literature. It has been said that בֶּן־אָנִישׁ was not in use in the Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (Dalman, *Words*, 237; but cf. Dalman, *Dialektproben*, 28). On the other hand, Fiebig (*loc. cit.*) thinks the term was a current Messianic title, which Jesus adopted, expanded, and ennobled. In a general way it may be said that בֶּן־אָנוּשׁ meant the *individual*, while בֶּן־אָנִישׁ meant the *class* or *community*. This is suggested in the passage 'the remnant of Jacob . . . that tarried not for man (בֶּן־אָנוּשׁ), nor waited for the son of man' (בֶּן־אָנִישׁ, Mic 5⁷ ^(Heb. 6) Targ.). Ezekiel is called 'son of man' (בֶּן־אָדָם) as representative of the people; he is so called more than ninety times.

Historically the term 'Son of man' in the Gospels is chiefly due to Daniel and the pre-Christian apocalyptic literature, especially the Enoch Books. The passage in Daniel, בֶּן־אָנוּשׁ, 'like a son of man' (7¹³), has been the pivot of much discussion. In the intention of the Danielic author the expression was probably a symbolization of the kingdom of Israel. The Semitic idiom 'son of man' is synonymous with man or an individual of mankind, and in Daniel pictures one in human appearance typifying the ascendancy of Israel. The Jewish apocalyptic writers sometimes read a Messianic meaning into this passage. Israel was the 'son of God,' and the faithful remnant became the representative of the nation. Is this representative of the people 'the Son of man'? It is

with the return of 'the Son of Man.' Our immediate point, however, is that, just as τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου stands for τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, so it apparently stands for the personal pronoun.

Mk 8²⁷, Τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;

Mt 16¹³, Τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; (cf. Lk 9¹⁸).

From the simplicity and directness of our Lord's speech it is quite likely that He usually spoke in the first person. In the passage quoted Mk. no doubt shows the primitive form of the question. Matthew's introduction of τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, for Mark's με, is editorial and Messianic. It is almost certain that the Christian society interpolated into the early tradition the phrase 'the son of man' where originally the first personal pronoun stood alone. It is doubtful, therefore, whether Jesus did apply to Himself the title 'the Son of Man' as frequently as He is represented to have done in the Gospels. Lietzmann certainly goes too far when he concludes that 'Jesus never applied to Himself the title "Son of Man" at all, because it does not exist in Aramaic, and upon linguistic grounds cannot exist' (*Der Menschensohn*, 85). It is true that the regular translation of בְּרִאשִׁית (בְּרִאשִׁית) would be 'the man' ('man' or 'a man'), yet 'the son of man' would be a possible rendering. If the Aramæans wished to say 'the son of man,' they surely could have expressed it. Though אֲנִי בְרִאשִׁית does not appear in the older Jewish Aramaic literature, it is probably sufficient for the N.T. idiom to find אֲנִי בְרִאשִׁית in the Jewish Galilæan and the Christian Palestinian. Though definite data are wanting, it may be assumed that this form='a man' was known in the vernacular of Jesus. The unusual Greek ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου may have been an over-literal translation of the Aramaic by our Lord Himself (see below). [Note.—The Syriac employed ܐܢܝܢ in phrases where the idiom would hardly be expected, e.g. ܐܢܝܢ ܕܝܡܝܢ, 'son of his day'='same day' (Dt 24¹⁵, Onk. ܝܡܝܢ); ܐܢܝܢ ܕܫܥܪܐ, 'son of his hour'='straightway' (Mt 5¹³); ܐܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܐ, 'son of the back'='backward' (Gn 9²³). This suggests the idiom which may have produced the form ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, namely, ܐܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܐ, 'his son (who is) of man.'

Compare: ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ, 'the fame of him,

(which is) of Jesus' (Mt 4²⁴); ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ, 'the fame of him,

'her daughter (who is) of Herodias' (Mk 6²²). Even the Greek of this passage suggests the idiom: τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος.]

But to return to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as a paraphrase for the personal pronoun. The old Syriac (Sin.) of the passage quoted above (Mk 8²⁷) may indicate the form of the original: ܡܢ ܐܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ, 'concerning what do men speak about me, who I am?' In Palestinian Targumic Aramaic this may be rendered: ܡܢ ܐܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ. Another passage in which the title 'son of man' was substituted for an original personal pronoun is the following:

Mt 5¹¹ . . . ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ.

Lk 6²² . . . ἔνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

The Lucan form can scarcely be genuine, it is not quite suitable to the context. It represents some development of the Christian conception in harmony with the eschatological doctrine.

Our Lord sometimes spoke of Himself as ὁ υἱός, and not ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Thus He spoke when His relation to the Father was in His thoughts. This is characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, but finds expression also in the Synoptics. For example: Mk 13³², περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης . . . οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι . . . οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ. [Cf. Mt 24³⁶, the plural τῶν οὐρανῶν, and the addition of μόνος.] Logically the passage should read: 'Concerning that day . . . no one knows, except the Father, not even the angels . . . nor the Son.' Why ὁ υἱός and not ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in this instance? 'Not ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου but ὁ υἱός absolutely, as contrasted with ὁ πατήρ' (Swete, *in loc.*). This absolute use of ὁ υἱός (found in Mt 11²⁷=Lk 10²²; cf. Mt 21^{47c}) is rare in the Synoptics. In styling Himself ὁ υἱός our Lord may have been influenced by ܐܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܐ, God's adopted Israel, His representative of world-dominion—an idea focussed in a personal Messiah (Ps 2⁷). The explanation that ὁ υἱός is here employed absolutely of our Lord Himself as contrasted with the Father is no doubt sound theologically, but is there a philological reason lurking in the Aramaic record? In Aramaic οὐδεὶς was probably ܐܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܐ, 'no man,' 'no one'; hence an expression like ܐܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ . . . ܐܢܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܐ might be read 'not a man . . . not a son of man,' or 'not any one . . . not the son of any one.' This would appear not only tautologous, but quite misleading. [For the construction οὐδεὶς

= לֹא אִישׁ, see Dt 34⁶ Onk. For אִישׁ = 'any one,' cf. לֹא אִישׁ דִּילִי, 'any one belonging to me'; לֹא אִישׁ דִּיךְ, 'to any one belonging to thee' (*Assuan Pap.* K. 8. ro). *Babl. Tal.* uses אִישׁ in a similar way.]

To attempt to turn the passage before us (Mk 13⁸²) into Aramaic can be little more than an interesting speculation. We can never be sure of the idioms employed by our Lord. For אִישׁ . . . אִישׁ = לֹא . . . לֹא, we may compare . . . יִשְׁבְּקִיךָ וְלֹא לֹא, 'not will he fail thee, neither (and not) destroy thee, nor (and not) . . .' (Dt 4³¹, Onk.; cf. וְלֹא דִין וְלֹא רִבּ, 'and neither suit nor process,' *Assuan Pap.* D. 21. 22). The exact equivalent of εἰ μή is not certain; the common Hebrew is בִּי-אִם. [In our passage Delitzsch gives מְבַלְבֵּרִי, a rare compound.] For בִּי-אִם the Targums sometimes employ אִלְהֵן (cf. Gn 15⁴ 42¹⁵, Nu 35³³), and this is perhaps the most suitable word. [We find also בִּר מִן, e.g. לִית אֱלֹהֵא בִר מִן (2 S 7²², Targ. Talmud, *ibid.*). The Syriac has ܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܢ ܐܝܢ = אִלְהֵן]. For εἰ the usual Aramaic verb is יָדַע, and the form required to express the sense of our passage is probably יְהוֹדַע (aphel impf., cf. Dn 2²⁵). A Judæan rendering of the whole passage would be something like this: בְּרִם עַל-יּוֹמָא הָהוּא וְשַׁעֲתָא: הָהוּא לִית אִישׁ יְהוֹדַע וְאַף-לֹא מְלֹאכְתָּא דְשִׁמְעָא אֶף-לֹא בִר אִלְהֵן אֲבָא (אִישׁ = אִישׁ).

That Jesus employed the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as indicative of a present Messiahship must be granted. There were progressive stages in the content of the title to the disciples and probably to our Lord Himself, though doubtless He realized the Messianic reality of His life long before He declared it to His followers. Until the secret of Jesus was revealed to the disciples, they did not clearly connect Him with the 'Son of Man' of whom He spoke. After they understood the secret, they accepted the term as indicating our Lord's exaltation in the 'Coming Age.' We do not know at what period in His life our Lord realized His Messianic office. This was the first stage in a spiritual evolution veiled behind the paradoxical title 'Son of Man.' The revelation of this fact to the disciples—through the announcement of death, resurrection, and exaltation—was the second stage. Though this fact was disclosed to the disciples—the initiated—other hearers still supposed that the 'Son of Man,' to whom He

referred, was other than Himself. It is evident that the Messiahship of Jesus is bound up in the use and connotation of this title. The historical problem has really been solved linguistically, and Dalman has shown the linguistic possibility of the title 'Son of Man' in the native dialect of Jesus. It is clear from the records that after Peter's confession our Lord freely used the title to indicate the manner of His coming again. The title is complex and unique, and no single interpretative theory can exhaust its significance. We may summarize these specific lines of connotation and outlook, and say that our Lord used this title (a) to indicate a Divine mission—prophetic, (b) to suggest a representative character—Messianic, (c) to intimate a future ascendancy—eschatological.

In admitting the eschatological use of the title 'Son of Man,' we must not fall into an extreme interpretation. We easily escape the purely historical theory of Strauss, but we may be misguided by the purely eschatological theory of Weiss. Both theories empty many Gospel passages of their true content. That Jesus did use the title in a transcendental sense, in harmony with some apocalyptic anticipations, seems quite evident. 'As the sequel to His death and resurrection He will return to the world again as a superhuman Personality.' We have already intimated that the disciples did not always clearly understand whether Jesus in using this title referred to Himself or to another, whose coming He simply heralded. Some scholars affirm that uncertainty must exist whether Jesus did actually identify Himself with the 'Coming Son of man,' who according to apocalyptic hope would appear 'with clouds of the heavens' (cf. Dn 7¹³, Enoch 62³, *Sib. Orac.* 3⁴⁹, 50, *et al.*). It is further affirmed that the early Christian tradition accepted the identification, and this became embodied in the Gospel records. This procedure is simply to play fast and loose with N.T. documents. The modern method of accepting or rejecting as valid utterances of Jesus those which support or discredit personal theories of expositors, is thoroughly unscientific and valueless. Sayings of Jesus, which are sustained by the best textual authorities, are to be accepted even when to modern scholars they may in some instances seem to contradict other utterances of our Lord. No phase of our Lord's life is recorded with so much detail as His trial. It is clear from the narrative that Jesus identified

Himself with the 'Coming Son of Man,' and that He was so understood by His hearers: Mk 14⁶²⁻⁶⁴ καὶ ὤψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως . . . ἡκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας (cf. Mt 26⁶⁴; Lk 22⁶⁹). This utterance clearly referred to the prophecy of Daniel (7¹³), and probably to the words of the Psalm (110¹). Our Lord, therefore, definitely identified Himself with the prophetic Messiah, and it was this identification that settled His condemnation. The historical fact of condemnation for blasphemy is strong proof of the genuineness of this utterance and claim of Jesus. The prefatory words of Lk., ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, are absent from Mk., and probably due to the Evangelist, who read the humiliation in the light of the resurrection. In any case this Lucan phrase, and Mt.'s ἀπ' ἄρτι, must not be pressed literally. The meaning can only be 'shortly'; the 'sitting on the right hand' could not be supposed to begin before the ascension. The δύναμις in this passage is apparently synonymous with the μεγαλειότης elsewhere referred to (Lk 9⁴³; cf. He 1³). The word δύναμις is the correct rendering of דְּבִירָתָא. Is there any Aramaic connexion between the use of this word in the ministry of Jesus and the cry from the Cross (ὦ δύναμις μου, ὦ δύναμις, κατέλευσάς με) as found in the Gospel of Peter? That the original of our passage was Aramaic is further suggested by Luke's addition of τοῦ Θεοῦ, an explanation for Gentile readers. The original may be suggested, but there is no certainty of the exact form: תְּהוֹן בְּרִאשֵׁית יְהִיב לְיִמִּינָא דְּבִירָתָא וְאַחֵי עַם-עֲנִי שְׂמִיָּא.

The 'Coming' of the Son of Man is expressed by the technical term παρουσία (Mt 24³, 27, 37, 39). Perhaps in the Gospels the word was used by our Lord alone. In Mt 24³ the term was perhaps put into the question of the disciples by a redactor in the light of Christ's teaching which immediately follows. It is possible that our Lord employed the Greek word, which already had a definite regal significance in the Empire. In the Greek authors the word means 'being present,' rather than 'becoming' or 'arrival' (cf. Herodian, i. 3. 13; Demosth. 674. 24; Diod. Sic. i. 29; Polyb. 23. 10, 14). Its use for the visit of a king is established in the papyri as early as the second century B.C., for instance: καθ' ἃς ἐποείσθ' ἐν Μέμφει παρουσίῳς, 'on the occasion of your [King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra] visits to Memphis' (Paris

Pap. 26¹⁸). With this compare: οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Mt 24²⁷). There is perhaps no known Aramaic substantive corresponding exactly with the Greek παρουσία, hence our suggestion that our Lord may have employed the Greek term itself. The Syriac Versions use ܐܬܬܐ=Hebrew בָּא. The Aramaic ܕܝܪ is not so suitable, though it is employed in the sense of 'arrival' (cf. Ps 110¹, Targ.; Dn 6²¹). If we read the passage idiomatically—'so shall be his coming who is Son of man'—it will suggest the translation with ܐܬܬܐ (in the infinitive with suffix) thus: ܐܬܬܐ ܕܝܪ ܕܝܠܕ ܕܝܠܕ.

It must be confessed that no consistent theory has yet been advanced to account for the origin and connotation of the expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. To say, on the one hand, that it was simply borrowed from the O.T. and apocalyptic literature, or, on the other, to affirm that it was purely eschatological, is to leave much unexplained. To maintain that Jesus did not use the phrase at all, and that it was the invention of the later Christian society, is to wreck textual authority and empty many Synoptic passages of all significance. The problem is not solved by any knowledge of Aramaic, though valuable suggestions have been made in this field. We learn that the form ܐܬܬܐ became current in Galilee in the second century A.D. This is testified by passages in the Jerusalem Talmud. It is probable, though definite proof is wanting, that it was current much earlier (cf. Fiebig, *Der Menschensohn*, 33-36, 59 f.). It is to be presumed that there was some Aramaic expression having the precise meaning 'the son of man' [cf. Hilgenfeld, *Z. f. Wiss. Theol.* 1897, p. 475]. Just as ܐܬܬܐ is 'son of Jonas' in Aramaic, so ܐܬܬܐ is 'son of man.' Our Lord needed a personal appellation which would sum up His relation to God and to man, to the present and the future. Here was at hand a phrase in Aramaic which already involved certain vague Messianic conceptions. There is perhaps no better solution of the problem than the direct affirmation that Jesus intentionally translated the elastic ܐܬܬܐ in a rather over-literal fashion, and Himself introduced into the Gospel tradition the somewhat mystic, yet very suggestive, Greek expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

It is possible that the title 'Son of Man' veiled some inexpressible knowledge and experience of

our Lord. It was the Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus that created the events of the ministry. But this Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus was probably a secret into which the disciples never truly entered. And since the life of Jesus must be reconstructed on the ground of the character and momentum of His self-consciousness, it follows that this reconstruction is impossible from the tradition of men, who never fully realized the nature and purpose of that self-consciousness. No rearrangement of Mk. or of all the Gospels could produce a consecutive history of the life of Jesus. Mere critical questions, therefore, have little value

in gaining for us a clear view and outline of the real progress of Jesus in the fulfilment of His mission. The vital problem has its centre in the conception which Jesus had of His own Messiahship, and with this is bound up His conception of the Kingdom of God. We are not chiefly anxious to get an answer to the question, 'Who do *men* say that I, the Son of man, am?' nor to the question, 'Who do *ye* say that I, the Son of man, am?' But the question to which most of all we desire an answer (if we may put a new question into the lips of Jesus) is this: 'Who do *I* say that I, the Son of man, am?'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

What a Pity!¹

'Know you not that you are the temple of God.'—
1 Co 3¹⁶.

YOU'VE been hearing about St. Paul's, haven't you, and the fuss they are making about it up in London? And no wonder they are all so scared! For St. Paul's is such a wonderful place. It's so huge, for one thing. Why, your church would only make a kind of porch for it. And such great men are buried in it—Nelson and Wellington among them. And there's the Whispering Gallery, that eerie kind of place, and the great splendid dome, and above all the gold cross glistening in the sunshine. London is proud of many things. But there are very few of which she is prouder than her glorious cathedral. Little wonder when they buried Wren in it, the man who had thought it all out and built it, they cut those words above his grave, 'If you want to see my monument, look round you.' For it was a marvellous thing he did.

And now it is in danger. Something must be done, or else, not at once, and not in a few years, but some time soon, it may all crash and rumble down with a long roar into ruins. Something must be done! But they are not just sure what it should be! One thinks this, and another that, and yet another urges something else would be far better. And the people are getting fidgety.

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

You know how you felt that day Mother was taking you to something dreadfully exciting, and on the way she met a friend, and they talked, and they talked, and they talked. 'She's coming now,' you thought. But no! they began all over again. And you couldn't keep still, were just itching to get on; pulled at her hand, but she didn't notice; spoke, but she paid no heed. Well, the people are like that. 'Oh, don't waste time talking, but do something,' they keep saying, 'or by and by St. Paul's may tumble down.' But, after all, what is it all about? And what's gone wrong? Such a wee thing, you and I would think.

That vast dome is very, very heavy. Wren knew it would be so, and that the ground beneath is soft. And so he had great pillars built to hold it up. You remember when Dad took you to the football match, or was it to see the Prince of Wales pass? Anyway, there was a crowd, and you were too small to see over. And so Dad swung you up on his shoulder, where you could see splendidly. But every now and then you asked him if you were not getting heavy. And he laughed, and said he could carry you all day.

So the pillars should have been able to hold up the dome quite easily. But some one scamped his work. They look quite solid, these huge pillars, as if made of solid stone as they were meant to be. But they are not! The outside is quite solid. But within there is only a mass of soft rubbly stuff that is crumbling a little. And that is what is

causing all the bother. Isn't that a pity? And doesn't it seem stupid. They took such pains to build a glorious thing, and, just for the lack of a very little more pains, it may all be spoilt. The Cathedral is splendid, the dome is splendid, everything is splendid. But because the pillars were scamped, everything may be lost. That is what often happens.

Suppose you were playing a football match against an older and heavier team. And suppose you played up well, even scored indeed; and then during the last five minutes tired and let them score and score again, and win after all. That would be a pity, to play so well, and lose for lack of such a little more.

Or you remember that night you couldn't get a sum to work out right, tried and tried, got all inky and smudged and mixed up. And then at last you got it. But you were so tired and sleepy by then, with your eyes half-shut, that you wrote it out in a hurry, didn't take it down right, and got no marks after all. What a pity, to lose all your pains for lack of such a little more!

But there is worse than that! Long, long ago God thought of something splendid, of just about the nicest thing even He ever thought about. It was to be a boy (or was it a girl?). Anyway it was to be a splendid girl, or a splendid boy, just the nicest even God could make. And He planned a strong little body for him. Or perhaps it wasn't very strong. She was to be a cuddly wee kind of girl. And He thought out such a merry laugh for him (or was it her?) and such happy sunny ways. Every one was to like her (or was it him?). I am so stupid I can't ever remember though you have told me twice already. And God worked and worked and worked for, oh, so long! And at last it all came true! And there was—*You*. For you were the boy or you were the girl. But oh, what a pity, something surely has gone wrong! Are you as nice as you were meant to be? Aren't you a wee bit tempery, and cross and sulky? Aren't you a little grabby and selfish now and then? Here was a Temple that was to be so lovely; and God took such pains in the making of it. And is it all going to be spoiled because the little bit of work left for you to do is being bungled? What a huge pity that would be!

Oh well, you say, it's only temper, only a little thing that doesn't matter, a flash and it's over. I know. But think of this. One wise man tells

us this about St. Paul's. You know what an inch is? From the tip of your finger up to the first joint, or even the second, isn't very far. Well, that's an inch. And, if you could make that into a thousand pieces, none of them would be very big. Even three of these wee bits would be quite small, all three of them together. Well, this man tells us—and I suppose he knows—that all that is the matter with St. Paul's is really that the pillars have given three-thousandths of an inch. And all this fuss has started over that! I know that it's a flash of temper, and it's over. I know that it's a case of sulks, and then the sun comes out. A wee thing, yes, but it's spoiling the whole Temple. And we must put it right at once, or it may all rumble down.

The wise men aren't quite sure what is best to do about St. Paul's, and who could mend it best. But we know where to go, and are quite certain who can help us most. We'll go to Jesus Christ, with those clever hands of His that could straighten what had bent crooked, and heal whatever had gone wrong. And we'll tell Him we have made a mess of things, that we are cross and tempery and selfish, that the bit of the Temple we were left to do is all quite spoiled. And He will put it right for us. But—we must lose no time.

Entertaining Angels.¹

'Be not forgetful to entertain strangers; for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.'—He 13².

We all like to be visited by friends from time to time. We look forward to seeing them because we know their ways and they know ours, and when they arrive it is such fine fun recounting to each other all that has happened to us since last we met.

But our friends were not always friends. At one time they were strangers to us. So it is that now and again we meet people whom we know perhaps only by name. But, having met them, we seem to like them. We are glad to have them with us in our homes, and we do our best to make them happy. Little by little we win each other's confidence as we come to know each other better. Perhaps we are drawn to them because we admire their conversation; or perhaps we like the way in which they always play the game. Soon we know that our world is better just because they

¹ Rev. James Nicol, Tealing.

have a place in it. We feel that it has been good for us to have met them and made friends of them. It would seem as if they have come into our lives as messengers bringing us good things—surely, that is to say, we have been entertaining angels unawares.

One day a man was sitting at the door of his house, which happened to be a tent. It was very hot, for it was noon in an eastern land, and, besides, he was an old man—so he was resting. Suddenly he saw three men, strangers to him, approaching him. They had fine faces, open, bright, and frank, and they carried no weapons of war. The old man rose to meet them and give them a welcome. He bade them be seated, he refreshed them, and advised them to rest. And then, later on, this kindly host, whose name—of course you knew it right away—was Abraham, discovered to his great surprise and to his great joy that the men were angels. That was a fine discovery to make—Abraham had been entertaining angels unawares.

Again, one of the old Latin poets tells us a similar story. In a little humble cottage lived an old couple, who, had they been modern folks, would have been called, I am sure, Darby and Joan, but whose Latin names were Philemon and Baucis. They lived very good lives, and their home was always so neat and clean, that they were never ashamed to welcome any visitor. One day they had a stranger at their door, whom they entertained as well as their humble lot would allow. Then they learned that their visitor was no less a person than one of the gods. Unknown to them, they had been entertaining not an angel, but a god.

The usual guests whom we welcome to our homes are common, ordinary people. But now I want you to think of other guests whom we receive into another kind of home—the home of our minds. Into our minds each one of us often asks certain guests to enter, and these guests are our thoughts. Now, when Abraham and that old couple of whom I told you welcomed their visitors to their homes, they were pretty certain that they would do neither their homes nor themselves any harm. Had the strangers been wicked-looking men, they would have let them pass. So, before we invite any thoughts to stay with us, we shall be very wise, first of all, to make certain that they will not do us any harm. A beautiful thought or idea we recognize at once, and we are glad to have him. We talk with him, we consider him, and we come

to like him. He grows upon us. We like to think how good a guest he is. There once lived in Australia a Scots minister named John F. Ewing. His mind was a home where he entertained as guests many beautiful thoughts. As a result he so loved little children that, when he died, the little ragged urchins of Toorak could scarcely, for tears, lay upon his grave the wreath they had given their pennies to buy. And then it is told of another man who loved boys and girls, and who in return was loved by them, namely, of Henry Drummond, that 'his life was the home of fair visions and noble thoughts and courteous, kindly deeds.' These men, during their whole lives, were entertaining angels, although perhaps they did not know it, and so to others they became beautiful and lovable. So, when we entertain such visitors as these fair and good thoughts in the home of our minds, we are, even if we do not know it at the time, entertaining angels, for surely these are messengers from God.

Now I want you to think of the great difference these guests make to us. Visitors always leave some impression upon us. We feel that life is not just the same as it was, the difference being due to their presence with us. But when our guests leave us, they too are different. They have been talking with us, playing with us, learning from us, and, perhaps, copying us. So they must be different. Therefore, when these beautiful and noble thoughts leave us, they cannot but be different. They came to us as messengers of God, and it is our business to send them on their way to keep doing God's work. But how do we do this? A man called Watts, at one time when things must have been looking fairly black for him, welcomed to his mind the thought called Hope. He only knew that at that time it was a thought worth welcoming, and he found that the more he entertained it in the home of his mind, the brighter his outlook became. Then it occurred to him that that was a thought worth giving expression to that others might benefit from it, and so he took his brushes, for he was a great artist, and painted a famous picture which all the world knows and loves, the picture to which he gave the name of 'Hope.' The great thought, at first a stranger, had come to him as a messenger from God; it lived in the home of his mind for a time. Then, when his guest left him, Watts himself was a better man, and the guest went on still to do God's work in giving to the

world the great lesson the artist himself had learned.

So it is in other spheres. To the poet's mind there comes a beautiful thought which remains his guest for a while, and when that thought leaves the poet, it is not simply a thought, but a thought clothed in the finest of language. Thus, one poet, thinking of God's great goodness, wrote the 23rd Psalm, while others speak to us of the grandeur of the world around us.

It is to visitors such as these that I would ask you to open the door of your minds now. It was not all chance that Abraham's visitors turned out to be angels. Abraham knew at once that they were good and honourable men; nor was it all chance that the old Roman couple I told you of happened to entertain a god. They must have had an idea that he was a person of good intentions. We are always seeing certain visitors approaching the door of our minds—these thoughts and ideas which come to us from time to time. Yes, and we all judge fairly well the character of these visitors. If we open the door of our minds to the pure and noble thoughts, we shall find that they have come as messengers from God to do us good. Let our minds then be 'the home of fair visions and noble thoughts,' as Henry Drummond's was, and when our guests leave us they will not leave us poorer but richer. We shall know then that we have been entertaining angels unawares. And, more than that, although these guests of ours, when they leave us, may not take the form of a great picture or a beautiful poem, what does it matter if they are observed to be courteous words and kindly deeds—for that is what our thoughts are when they leave us, no longer thoughts but words and deeds.

The Christian Year.

EASTER DAY.

Joy.

'That my joy might remain in you.'—Jn 15¹¹.
'And your joy no man taketh from you.'—Jn 16²².

1. *The Note of the Church's Festivals.*—The three great festivals of the Christian Church are those which celebrate the birth of the Son of God into the world, His victory over death, and the descent of the Holy Spirit. What was the significance of this choice of the three great days on which we are

bidden by the Church to be joyous and thankful? What were the three great festivals of the Jewish year? They were the Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles. The first of these fell at the vernal equinox; the second at the end of the early Eastern harvest; the third at the end of the vintage. They seem to be old agricultural festivals, made more sacred by being connected with great events in the national history. This is the history of most religious festivals all over the world; they are connected with the seasons of the year and with cherished memories in a nation's history. 'They joy before thee according to the joy in harvest,' says Isaiah, 'and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil.' We ourselves have felt the want of a day to celebrate the joy of harvest, and as our harvest falls in the Church's dead season we have established everywhere an unauthorized festival in the autumn, which, in the popular estimation, ranks with the great days of the Church's calendar.

Easter, too, is popularly regarded as a spring festival. We decorate our churches with spring flowers; while Christmas has a peculiar character as the feast of family affection, the festival of home—a word so dear to us all. But the Church was guided by other reasons in choosing her three great days. They commemorate the three stages in the redemption of mankind, and the foundation of Christ's Church. There are no more majestic passages in the New Testament than the opening verses of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John.

The glad tidings of great joy were of joy that sprang out of pain, loss, and disappointment. That is really the keynote of the Epistle to the Hebrews; the Fathers to whom God spake through their prophets in times past had all their dearest hopes disappointed. They saw Israel conquered and enslaved. They died in faith, not having received the promises, nor were the promises ever fulfilled as they hoped.

The Christian Church was born amid the death-throes of Jewish nationalism. All the hopes which the patriotic Jew associated with the name of David, and the hope of a Messiah, had to be surrendered before he could accept the true Son of David, the true Messiah, as his lord and king. He dreamed of a great conqueror. 'Gird thee with thy sword, and with thy thigh, O thou most mighty.' That was the dream; and the fulfilment was a

Babe lying in a manger. If we turn to Easter we find the same thing. Easter celebrates the victory of Christ over death. But was not this also a joy that sprang out of bitter sorrow, again following cruel loss and disappointment? The joy which the Mother of Jesus felt when she saw her Babe was a joy which had its roots in the pains of childbirth. The joy which she felt when she saw Him, or heard that others had seen Him after His resurrection, was a joy that had its root in a deeper pain. The sword had pierced through her very soul when she saw her Son dying on the cross.

Our third great festival has the same character. 'It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you.' Think of the desolation which the disciples felt when they had lost their Master for the second time. He had gone away, leaving them lonely. And then came the gift of the Holy Spirit to take His place, never again to leave them. That is what our Lord meant when He said, 'I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you.' Now, it is no accident that all our great festivals should have this character. Not joy simply, not mere light-hearted rejoicing, like the joy of harvest, or as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. Each commemorates a joy that sprang out of the heart of a sorrow; a birth after travail pangs; a resurrection after a bitter death; a new kind of intimacy after a tragic parting. This is always the character of Christian joy. It is the deepest secret of Christianity.¹

2. *Christ's Joy*.—But we know more about this joy. It is not only joy after pain. It is Christ's Joy. The world has never been able to understand the joy of Jesus Christ or even to believe in it. The general world and the Church alike have known Him as the Man of Sorrows, and it would surprise and shock many good Christians to hear Him spoken of as the joyous Saviour, as the Man of joy. In fact, that larger, deeper element has been overlooked because it was both too deep and too unearthly for the superficial eye.

The favours of fortune, the flatteries of ambition, the caresses of wealth had no place in His daily path. Externally it was such a life as the least favoured of mortals would not change for his own. Externally it was a rough, hard, bare, pinched life with no bright colours on its face, and no romance to paint its sky. And yet underneath all that was a

very heavenful of what He called joy, as much deeper than pleasure as the ocean is deeper than a pool. His joy was the wonderful thing in Christ's life. A river of satisfaction clear as crystal, running to ceaseless music and never running low. His one wish was that all whom He loved might have it. 'That my joy might remain in you.'

Was Christ's joy part of the mystery of His divine nature and therefore beyond human comprehension? No: it could not be altogether that, or He would hardly have prayed that we might be sharers in it. Indeed, He Himself has told us in part what it was and whence it came. First He walked continually in heavenly places. This earth was to Him a part of the Father's house, and in the very presence of the Father He lived and moved and had His being.

No less certain is it that He had an inexhaustible source of joy in the grandeur, depth, and infiniteness of His own sweet human love. His love for the disciples whom He trained. His love for the multitude whom He taught. His love for the sinners whom He pitied and forgave. His love for the diseased and sorrowful whom He healed and lightened of their woes, and for every child of man on whom His eyes rested. Men were all more or less dear to Him and lovable, and His heart was a fountain of pity, sympathy, and yearning affection.

3. *Our Joy*.—Christ longed above all things to give His joy to the men whom He had chosen, and, in fact, to all who should hereafter call Him Master. He regarded it as the highest attainment of the Christian, and a possible attainment of every Christian life.

There is everything in our Christian faith to make us glad if we truly hold it and do not merely think we hold it. It speaks to us through Christ's lips in uniformly cheerful tones. It asks the weary to come into its rest. It tells the anxious that all their cares are in God's heart. To the young it promises immortal youth, to the old renewal of hope and everlasting strength. To those who have failed it whispers of coming victory, to those who have been broken and bruised by sin it speaks of forgiveness and recovery. To all who are working to make the world better it sings infinite good cheer, and to those who are dejected because of the world's sadness and woes it sounds always the same clarion note of better things, and to all of us it keeps on affirming through every doubt that the world is God's world, and He loves it and never leaves it,

¹ W. R. Inge in *Christian World Pulpit*, cv. 1.

and all must be well in the end. That is the joy which Jesus gives, and no man can take it from us. There is nothing else of which that can be said. Most things are precarious enough. Happiness comes and goes and never stays long. Pleasures are the hobby of a day or the fashion of a season. Reputation and honour are at the mercy of every popular wind that blows. Wealth goes when death comes, if not before. But the joy which Christ gives is secure as heaven itself. No freaks of man or changes of fortune can touch that. It is hid with Christ in God beyond the reach of harm.¹

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Potencies of Faith.

'For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.'—1 Jn 5⁴.

This was the text which moved William Penn, Mr. Boreham says. When William Penn was managing his father's estate at Cork, the Quaker, Thomas Loe, came there, and Penn attended his meetings. 'It was in this way,' he tells us, 'that God, in His everlasting kindness, guided my feet in the flower of my youth, when about two-and-twenty years of age. He visited me with a certain testimony of His eternal Word through a Quaker named Thomas Loe.' The text at that memorable and historic service, like a nail in a sure place, fastened itself upon the mind of the young officer. Thomas Loe preached from the words: 'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.'

The victory that overcometh the world! What is the world? The Puritans talked much about the world; and Penn was the contemporary of the Puritans. Cromwell died just as the admiral, Penn's father, was preparing to send his son to Oxford. Whilst, at Cork, Penn sat listening to Thomas Loe's sermon on the faith that overcometh the world, John Milton was putting the finishing touches to *Paradise Lost*, and John Bunyan was languishing in Bedford Gaol. Each of the three had something to say about the world. To Cromwell it was, as he told his daughter, 'whatever cooleth thine affection after Christ.' Bunyan gave his definition of the world in his picture of Vanity Fair. Milton likened the world to an obscuring mist—a fog that renders dim and indistinct the great realities and vitalities of life.

¹ J. G. Greenhough, *Sunset Thoughts: or, Aftermath*, 55.

It is an atmosphere that chills the finest delicacies and sensibilities of the soul. It is too subtle and too elusive to be judged by external appearances. In his fine treatment of the world, Bishop Alexander cites, by way of illustration, still another of the contemporaries of William Penn. He paints a pair of companion pictures. He depicts a gay scene at the frivolous and dissolute Court of Charles the Second; and, beside it, he describes a religious assembly of the same period. The first gathering appears to be altogether worldly: the second has nothing of the world about it. Yet, he says, Mary Godolphin lived her life at Court without being tainted by any shadow of worldliness, whilst many a man went up to those solemn assemblies with the world raging furiously within his soul!²

To the spirit of evil there is always opposed, in unceasing conflict, 'whatsoever is born of God.' All spiritual aspiration, all moral passion, all endeavour after righteousness, all sacrifice for human well-being are born of God. The inspiration and strength of all these moral and spiritual energies is faith, which is the first-born of God within the soul. Faith, then, faces the world, and it overcomes. It has three potencies: first, the potency of vision; second, the potency of venture; third, the potency of victory.

1. *Faith as Vision*.—By vision is meant a perception of truths hidden from unenlightened eyes. Faith is contrasted with sight, which beholds the outward world of light and order and beauty. It is contrasted with knowledge, which is the mastery of the facts and laws of the visible world, and of the data of universal human experience. Faith is not to be contrasted with reason, for faith should be both reasoned and reasonable. But it rises above a mere intellectual apprehension of, an assent to, moral and spiritual truth. It has an environment of which multitudes are not aware, and a consciousness of a Personality whose shadow some men have never seen upon the path. Faith is an impassioned consent of the soul in its prospect of the spiritual world.

Now the strength and force of faith as vision depends upon the range of the horizon. Some men have faith only in righteousness. They believe that we live under the governance of immutable moral laws. They deny that victory lies with the big battalions. We have never lacked these believers in righteousness. In the autobiography of John

² F. W. Boreham, *A Handful of Stars*, 9.

Stuart Mill, in the penetrating portraiture of George Meredith, in the high and serious writings of John Morley, we have the steadfast assertion of a faith in righteousness, solemn, austere, controlling. There are men who have attained to no other faith, but they stand among us clothed upon with integrity and fidelity.

There are others who believe in the unseen. Faith in righteousness is merely a conviction of the supremacy of moral law. Faith in the unseen is an assurance that the world is not only under a reign of law, but is a part of a spiritual order. It is a belief not merely in such things unseen as love and truth, but in forces invisible which bear in upon men's spirits and affect their destinies.

Among them there stand Emerson with his illuminating and inspiring aphorisms; Matthew Arnold with his pathetic poems, instinct with the awe of the eternal; and Browning who, as a believer in the revelation of God in Christ, strikes with a more steadfast constancy the note of certainty and of confidence in the unseen.

The highest reach of faith is to believe in a living God. That was the faith which distinguished the Hebrew from all other races, and gave him the spiritual leadership of the nations. That faith was consummated in the revelation of Jesus Christ. That disclosure of God in Christ may be realized if we think of a man moving within the darkened room of a man sunk in a deep slumber. When the sleeper awoke he was dimly conscious that another personality was not far from him, and he heard the coming and going of his breathing. As he arose, he listened intently as a soft footfall fell upon his ears. As he stood still in wonder a whisper seemed to vibrate softly upon the air. But he found the message of the whisper difficult to understand. Suddenly the shutters which darkened the room were flung back, the light streamed in, and he saw the face of one who looked upon him with infinite love and desire. It was he who had awakened him from his sleep, and was now eager to hold him in his embrace. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

2. *Faith as Venture*.—Every man who has the vision passes on to make the venture. Even the man who believes in righteousness takes all its risks. He stakes his course and career on the certainty of the supremacy of righteousness in the world. The man who believes in the unseen makes the venture of resisting the coarse allurements of sense. He

disdains the gratification of a callous greed or a sensual pleasure. But the man who has the vision of God makes more daring ventures. Like Abraham he goes out not knowing whither he goes.

In the simplest experience, and at every stage of life, the vision of faith passes into the venture. Principal Fairbairn, of Oxford, has described the venture of faith by recalling a reminiscence of his early childhood. 'As a little child I have trembled to cross at night the courtyard of a lonely country mill. Every little object that moonlight or starlight revealed to me in other than natural proportions was a source of fear, and seemed to hide shapes terrible to childish flesh and blood. But if my little hand was laid in the large hand of my father, I could cross the courtyard as gleefully and carelessly at night as at noonday.'

Mahy days of our life call for this venture. But there is one hour in which our vision passes on to its supreme and transforming experience. That is the hour on which a man, through faith in Christ Jesus, ventures his soul and its keeping, with his life, and its ordering, to Christ as Redeemer and Lord.

3. *Faith as Victory*.—The faith which is vision is not only venture in the critical choices of life, but it is victory throughout all the course of our years, and in the quiet level of every day's need. This does not mean that all our days will be a procession of triumph. It does not declare that the hopes of every loyal heart will be openly realized, and his testimony vindicated. There are times when 'the world' and its defiant powers of evil have their 'hour' and seem to prevail. That is the meaning of 'the trial of faith,' and to live in the world is a constant trial to every man who believes. But when faith endures the trial, it not only gains the victory, but it is the victory. Esther goes into the king's presence saying, 'If I perish, I perish.' She might have perished in her loyalty to God, but as she went in her faith was victory. The three Hebrew children went into the furnace of their affliction. Their victory was not achieved in the hour of their deliverance, but in the moment when they refused to bow the knee and accepted the penalty. The early martyrs who were slain in the arena seemed to have trusted God in vain. But even dull Roman consciences began to understand that these trembling men and women, who stood with uplifted eyes as they awaited the onset of the lions, were more than conquerors through their faith. The only peril of the believer is that which

Jesus anticipated when He said, 'I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.'¹

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Discouragement.

'He shall not fail nor be discouraged.'—Is 42^d.

In a hundred different ways discouragement of one kind or another thrusts its gloomy shadow across our path and chills our brightest days. Yet discouragement is about the hardest thing in the world to explain. Difficulty meets you squarely in the face, but discouragement haunts you. It is a kind of mental malaria, an insidious disease of the mind, sometimes chronic, sometimes acute, which poisons the will and paralyses its energies. That is what makes discouragement so often the vestibule of temptation. The discouraged man is ready to accept any relief, to take advantage of any open door that will deliver him from the intolerable pressure upon his soul.

In the old monasteries of Europe there was a species of mental or spiritual disease prevalent among the monks which was known by the name of *accidie*. In the Middle Ages this sin of *accidie* was so common that one of the fathers, Cassian, wrote an elaborate treatise upon it. What is *accidie*? Cassian defines it as disgust of soul or weariness of life.

There is no doubt a good deal of discouragement which is temperamental. Some people are born into the world at an angle at which they see everything under sable clouds. While they do no doubt serve a good purpose in restraining the unbalanced enthusiasm of sanguine people, at the same time they have a good deal to answer for in the way of adding to the depression of the world. But the sanguine temperament brings its discouragements. It is also true that a good many of our discouragements are dyspeptic in their origin. A little open-air exercise will do more than a religious service to chase away the blues for a good many of us. But the trouble with all this type of discouragement is that it is a contagious disease.

On the other hand, we must not forget—as indeed who can?—that there are a great many real discouragements in life which tax the faith and endurance of the bravest soul. They tax a man's grit and grace. There is no more striking example of a

business discouragement which was so overcome that it became a positive blessing than that of Sir Walter Scott. When at the age of fifty-five he found himself a ruined man, through the failure of his publishers, he wrote, 'I feel neither dishonoured nor broken down by the news I have received. I have walked my last in the domain which I have planted, sat for the last time in the halls which I have built; but death would have taken them from me if misfortune had spared me.' We know how that spirit conquered. From the magic pen of the great writer flowed that marvellous series of works the profits of which not only bought back Abbotsford and enabled him to pay his creditors to the last penny, but created for him a deathless name in literature.

This reminds us of the *hidden blessings of discouragement*. It is a good thing for a man or woman to be thoroughly discouraged once in a while; and that for several reasons. First of all because discouragement is an excellent discipline in *humility*. Discouragement is the great antiseptic of all conceit.

Discouragements not only train us in humility, they test and develop the will. It is not enough to say that discouragements are inevitable. The truest view is that which sees them as a necessity as well. Some men are like drums, you never hear of them until they are beaten. The greatest things in life—the great thoughts, the great discoveries, the great philanthropies—have been nurtured in sorrow, wrought out through discouragement, and finally established with smiles. Yet in order that this may be so we must remember that it is one thing to have discouragements, but quite another thing to be discouraged. How, then, are we to overcome our discouragements in life?

1. Remember that *discouragement can never be to the man of faith a permanent condition*. A distinguished man of science once said that whenever in the course of his researches he encountered an apparently insuperable obstacle he invariably found himself upon the brink of some new discovery. For every soul beset with discouragements there is the Psalmist's words, 'Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God: for I shall yet praise him, who is the health of my countenance, and my God.'

2. Remember in hours of discouragement the *things that encourage*. Learn to see the things we can credit ourselves with before the mercy-seat of God. Learn, before all else, that while our dis-

¹ W. M. Clow, *The Evangel of the Strait Gate*, 163.

couragements can be counted on the fingers of one hand, our blessings are unnumbered. And often discouragements stand at the parting of the ways in life, pointing out a new path of duty.

3. Lastly, remember *the blessed power that comes through prayer*. Nothing so quickens the spirit of prayer as this feeling of discouragement. Prayer links us to Him in whose bright lexicon of duty there is no such word as fail. 'He shall not fail, nor be discouraged.'

What a triumphant note of hope these words are ! From the human standpoint Christ did fail. In the world's judgment the Cross was the seal of His failure. Yet out of that symbol of defeat has proceeded the conquering spirit of mankind.¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Almond Blossom.

'Moreover, the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Jeremiah, what seest thou? And I said, I see a rod of an almond-tree. Then said the Lord unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I will hasten my word to perform it.'—Jer 1¹¹, 12.

Shakespeare tells us that we may find 'tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, sermons in stones, and good in everything'; and in our text we may with Jeremiah find 'tongues in trees.' We are out in orchard and garden. 'The rod of an almond-tree' means a blossoming branch; a branch of the almond-tree covered with its lovely pink-white blossom. Such a sight is suggestive—it speaks—there are 'tongues in trees.'

Now what followed was possibly this, and thus the text comes in. Jeremiah was in the orchard at Anathoth that still summer evening when this call to be a prophet came upon him, when he had passed through such a spiritual experience as these earlier verses describe. Pausing entranced after the intense experience, the prophet realized that his eyes were turned steadily towards a blossoming almond-branch; and he realized too, as happens often at such times, that he had been looking at the thing before him unconsciously, with eyes that saw not. But when the strain passed, and the thing before his eyes was really seen, then there came a voice into his spirit—'Jeremiah, what seest thou? Jeremiah, what are you looking at?'—and like one in a dream he said, 'I am looking at the branch of an almond-tree.' Then said the Lord, 'Thou hast well seen, for I will hasten My word to perform it.'

The point of the passage is that there is a kind of play upon the word 'almond-tree' and the word 'watch,' for these two words are almost identical. An 'almond-tree' in Hebrew is *Shakēd*, and it comes from the verb *Shakad*, which means 'to be sleepless' or 'to watch.' The tree is so called because it is the earliest blossoming tree in the East, the first to wake from its winter sleep.

'Jeremiah, what seest thou? And I said, I see the branch of a Waker; and Jehovah said to me, Thou hast well seen, for I am wakeful over my word to perform it.' Such is the parallel—'I see the branch of a Watcher; yes, for I watch over my word to perform it.'

So we can understand the prophet's vision. It is this habit of early wakefulness that is expressed by the Hebrew name of the tree, and when Jeremiah looked upon it that was the thought. If the tree, for this remarkable peculiarity, was a proverb of watching and waking, the sight of it, or a branch of it, with its white blossom, would be sufficient to suggest this idea. So thought Jeremiah, and God gave him the thought. Here is the emblem of wakefulness, and God says, 'I am wakeful, I keep watch over my word to perform it.'

This was the reassuring and inspiring thought which the blossoming almond-bough brought to Jeremiah. He was commanded to speak the word of One who slumbers not nor sleeps. In the end every word of His must be fulfilled to the last letter. Though the delay may be long like the winter sleep, and though the ears of men be dull of hearing, yet God will never speak in vain. 'I watch over my word to perform it.'

Is it not a lesson that comes to us every spring-time when the sleeping buds and seeds wake to life again? They have not been lost and buried and forgotten. God remembers them.

As we know very well, the ultimate value of any word must be determined by the character and intention of the person by whom it is spoken. We must take into account both the word and what lies behind the word. If a word is truth, then it lives; if it is spoken by a true man, if he who speaks it is sincere and sure and strong, then his word will be fulfilled.

Now it is in the direction of this thought that we find the teaching of the text. Jeremiah is brought to the conviction that he is commanded to speak a word which must be fulfilled, because it is God's word. The prophet's word might remain on the

¹ D. S. Mackay *The Religion of the Threshold*, 141.

earth seemingly as unproductive of any life as the twigs of an almond-tree in winter. But the breath of spring blows gently and genially upon it; and just as at the fit time the almond-tree burst into radiant life, covering itself with a snowy shower of lovely blossom, so in good time would the word sent forth from God prove its vitality and its power. It, too, would leap to life and blossom abundantly.

This is the message that encouraged the shrinking prophet at the beginning of his task—that his word is God's word, and therefore cannot fail—this truth that the will of God must be done and always is done, in the world that God has made and is making. He knows that, whatever be his own fortune, that word will go on conquering and to conquer till it has subdued all things to itself. So Jeremiah is strengthened at the beginning.

This, then, is the great thought of our text. We are here in the world, and the word of God is with

us. It has come to us by His prophets and messengers. God's word is here in the world, and God is in the world with the word, watching over it to perform it. We may believe that what was said of the word of Jehovah by Jeremiah is true of every word that is a word of God.

'Heaven and earth shall pass away; my words shall not pass away.'

Where is there such a message as this in Christ? He tells of God the Father and His infinite mercy. He speaks of life and love, of sin and forgiveness, of rest. He tells of a way that leads to life, and a way whose end is death. What a word is here in Christ! Who will trust it, venture his life upon it, believing that this is the way of peace and blessedness and immortality? Do we really believe that, amid all the voices that assail our ears, there is one voice, that is the Voice Divine? 'God has spoken unto us by His Son.'¹

¹ J. Rutherford, *The Seer's House*, 295.

Hinduism and Christianity: Some Points of Contact and Divergence.

BY THE REVEREND NICOL MACNICOL, M.A., D.LITT., POONA.

I.

THE study of Hinduism is indeed a study not of one religion but of all the religions, as set in the Indian environment and influenced by the Indian atmosphere. Its history is a history of all the toil and struggle of the human spirit, seeking God. For that reason it is a study that should stir in us, the deeper we probe it, a profound emotion. The more clearly its outlines emerge before us from the dust and haze of the long centuries of its history, whether we perceive it as the thought-product of the minds of ancient sages brooding over the mysteries of life and death and God in their desert solitudes, or as the movement in the heart of an unlettered peasant bowing before a red-painted stone, the more we feel every instinct of easy criticism and contempt changed to sympathy and respect. From the same root of aspiration have sprung, not only gross and cruel superstition, but profound and passionate conjecture as to God.

Hinduism is a strange, formidable, sometimes monstrous, thing, but it is never contemptible, as nothing is contemptible that is the product of deep feeling or deep thought. We must always endeavour to understand it even when it seems to us most fantastic. Sir Alfred Lyall was a student of Hinduism who realized much of its breadth and variety and mystery. He compares it in one passage to 'a troubled sea, without shore or visible horizon, driven to and fro by the winds of boundless credulity and grotesque invention.' If we are to understand the sick heart of India, and are to be enabled, in the name and by the power of Christ, to heal it, we must mark its history and listen to its cries and its complaints as we have them written large for us in strange hieroglyphics in this religion.

If Hinduism, then, is a mosaic of almost all the types and stages of religious aspiration, Christianity should be able, as no other religion can, to furnish the key to its understanding in all its divers aspects,

and the standard by which their value can be judged. For Christianity is not a rival religion; it is, we believe, in its essentials the expression of that which Hinduism, 'with stammering lips and another tongue,' has been striving to utter, the realization of its incoherent dreams. For the Gospel of Christ, as Dean Inge reminds us, 'is not a religion, but religion itself in its most universal and deepest significance.' Just because that is what we believe Christianity to be, Hinduism can be compared with it, not as an alien and hostile system, but as a rich treasure-house of human hopes and fears and longings, by means of which we may test the capacity of the Christian faith to satisfy the heart of man. Hinduism is a great museum of human needs and searchings, and for that reason it must discover to us many places of desire where it reaches towards and so confirms the Christian revelation.

But it is not our concern here to seek for points of contact between Christianity and the vast continent of Hinduism. That is a task that is beyond our scope. There is another task that can be undertaken, and that is more practicable and more likely to prove fruitful. It is possible for us to discover and to examine some of the forms that the living Hinduism of to-day is taking, and to judge how far they are in agreement with Christian faith and practice, and what readjustments or more radical reformation may be needed to make that agreement more complete. It is impossible for Hindus or the adherents of any faith to come into contact continuously with Christians, even very imperfect Christians, and to breathe the atmosphere of a belief so significant and so widely prevailing, and not to have their own sentiments and convictions modified. This is bound to happen, and it has been happening in India by a continuous process that has gone on during the whole of the past century.

The process of change has been largely an unconscious one. But what was before instinctive and unaware of itself is to-day being more deliberately pursued. The transformation and readjustment of Hinduism under the stimulus of Christianity is becoming an acknowledged policy. Distinguished Indians who would not hesitate to describe themselves as Hindus are turning their attention to the task of reconciling, as far as that is possible, Hinduism and Christianity. Time was when, to any one who called himself with any

sincerity of conviction a Hindu, Christianity was simply the enemy. No points of contact could be conceded. And if a change has come about in this matter on the part of many thoughtful Hindus, it has to be recognized that there has been a not dissimilar change on the part of Christians. Hinduism is being studied with a new sympathy and desire to understand. It is no longer merely 'of the devil,' as it was to our ancestors. There is thus a rapprochement between those who too often in the past occupied relations wholly of antagonism, and there is, at least, some attempt to come together in a common desire to find and follow truth. The Arya Samaj is still strongly hostile to Christianity, but it frankly admits that Christianity has compelled Hindus to endeavour to restate their faith. The attitude of others is more friendly. Few Christians, probably, would accept as correct a statement that recently appeared on this subject in the *Indian Social Reformer*, probably the most respected and the most worthy of respect of all the Indian journals, but it testifies to a new spirit of accommodation that is abroad to-day. 'To Hindus,' it says, 'in which term we include Indian Christians, Christ no longer stands out as a hostile and destructive influence. A Hindu-Christian synthesis is being worked out by men in different parts of India, which, we may hope, will become an abiding bond of sympathy between this country and the Christian world.' Again, Professor Radhakrishnan, an able Hindu student of philosophy, who has set himself the task of finding out and emphasizing some of the affinities between 'the fundamentals of the Hindu faith' and Christianity, affirms that 'Christian thinkers are engaged in a reconstruction of belief that brings Christianity nearer the Hindu religion, and promises to bridge the gulf that separates the Christian and the other religions.' To bridge the gulf may prove a more difficult engineering problem than these pioneers realize, but certainly it is good that they are taking measurements and preparing plans. The pontifex has taken the place of the fanatic.

It may be advisable, however, at the outset to indicate certain elements in Christianity which are essential to it as not a sectarian system, but 'religion itself in its most universal and deepest significance.' If that be a true account of what Christianity is, the Christian dare not sell the bridge-head of which he is the keeper, even if it be to bring

about so notable a reconciliation. One of the fundamentals which he dare not surrender is the requirement that religion shall be a way of life, and not merely an explanation of the meaning of the universe, that it shall, therefore, be a truth that is through and through ethical. Another principle that is inseparable from that first one is that the God at the centre of the religion must be a moral Being, one, in a word, such as the name 'Father' on the lips of Christ describes. There follows, accordingly, as a third fundamental, the moral supremacy and centrality of Christ Jesus, that indeed which is signified by the ascription to Him of the title Son of God. These conditions may seem to the Hindu to make the gulf unbridgeable, and, indeed, it may be that that is so. A leap may be necessary, a leap by one who, in doing so, takes his life in his hand. After all, Christianity, and indeed essential religion, means, as Donald Hankey put it, 'betting one's life that there is a God.' But while that is to be fully recognized, at the same time there certainly are points, which it is well to discover and emphasize, at which Hinduism touches Christianity or approaches it at least within stepping distance.

To clear the path of approach it may be well to recognize that the foreigner may frequently misinterpret Hinduism, deducing certain conclusions from its theory which may appear logical, and yet which the deeper logic of experience may have modified in actual Hindu belief and practice. This may be so, for example, in regard to the pantheism that is so often taken for granted as a fundamental rock of offence in Hinduism. No one, I suppose, not even the author of *The Dynasts*, has ever lived the life indifferent to consequences, indifferent to good or ill, that seems to follow from pantheism and a belief in the blind movements of the Immanent Will, 'An automatic sense, Unweeting why or whence.' In India there is a saying that is quite often heard on the lips even of plain people when they wish to put aside the pain of some untoward event or to justify a manifestly immoral way of living. They say, 'The doer and He who causes to do are one.' That seems the end of all responsibility and of all ethical values. The writer once had occasion to point out the moral perils that that attitude seemed to involve. An Indian friend, however, assured him—and his assurance must be taken as that of one who knew—that, as often used, the phrase means no more than what

the Christian means when he resigns himself to suffering and says, 'God's will be done.' We may take it at least that an unmoral pantheism has never ruled the lives of Indian people—unless, it may be, of a few philosophers—that there, as everywhere, conscience will keep breaking in, and that the moralization of pantheistic thinking is proceeding at the present time, especially among the thoughtful classes. Fortunately for the world, life continually modifies our theory, and, as there have been few in India who have lived a lawless life because they were supposed to be the unconscious instruments of the sole-existent One or to have passed, while yet alive, beyond good and evil, so there have been few in the West whose Calvinism has raised them as high or cast them down as low as 'Johannes Agricola in Meditation.' The theory of Advaita may seem finally at strife with Christianity and, indeed, with the life of religion, and yet the living Hinduism of men and women who profess that doctrine may prove to be far less so in reality and may be steadily travelling towards agreement.

To the student, who approaches the religion of the Upaniṣads from a study of the documents, or who contemplates from without the law of *karma*, to all appearance so inexorable, it seems as though there was no place for worship to be found in the former, and no room for human freedom and the Divine grace and forgiveness in the case of the latter. And yet Professor Radhakrishnan and, no doubt, many others like him, refuse to accept these conclusions. Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar, for example, is known to be one of the noblest and most devout of Indian theists, and yet this sincere worshipper of a God of holiness finds much of his spiritual nourishment in what to some appear the pantheistic husks of Upaniṣad speculation. It is well if these things are possible, and if, just as the harsh anthropomorphism of Old Testament religion can be rejected by the Christian while he studies the prophets and psalmists and feeds his soul upon their inspired intuitions of the Divine character and purpose, so also the student to-day of the ancient Hindu scriptures may take the wheat and cast away the tares.

We see Hinduism setting its house in order and seeking to free itself from some elements at least in it that have been a reproach and a scandal in such a book as the courageous exposition of his religion recently issued by a learned scholar, Babu

Govinda Das.¹ His aim, as he describes it, is to assist in the house-cleaning of Hinduism that he sees to be so urgently necessary, and to get rid of 'all the degenerate tissue and toxic stuff that has gathered therein.' He agrees with Professor Radhakrishnan in retaining *karma* in reconstituted Hinduism, but, as in the case of the Professor so with this interpreter, it is to be a new law which is vaguely conceived, but which is alleged to leave room for moral growth and moral responsibility. It is united with a modified doctrine of rebirth which seems to signify little more than 'other heights in other worlds, God willing.' It is realized that a truly ethical life demands that there be room in it for repentance, and that an ethically exalted Deity who rules by the influences of His Spirit must be a God who can forgive and who finds out a way of forgiveness. The interest of these suggestions lies in the fact that their authors are labouring to moralize their religion, and so to bring it into line with such an ethical religion as Christianity. Unconsciously or half-consciously, Christianity is the standard by which they judge its tenets. This is well, and the further the process proceeds the more it will be possible to build a bridge between the two faiths.

If, indeed, Babu Govinda Das is right, Hinduism is not to be described as a faith at all. It is

¹ *Hinduism*, by Govinda Das, of the Benares Hindu University. Madras, Natesan & Co.

'an attitude, a discipline, a philosophy of life,' and there is no reason why those who have that inheritance should not pass, bearing all that is worthy in their inheritance with them, into the obedience of Christ. A Western student of Hinduism has maintained that it has only two distinctive marks that apply to all its Protean forms, namely, worship of the cow and reverence for Brahmins. It is easy to prove that there are classes of Hindus to whom neither of these tests applies. Babu Govinda Das boldly affirms that Hinduism has no peculiar criteria by which it can be distinguished. Any one who calls himself a Hindu is a Hindu. Hinduism is, he says, 'an anthropological process rather than a religion,' and therefore it is 'free and untrammelled.'

This may seem to be the freedom of a drifting fog-bank, driven to and fro by every wind. It is hardly the freedom of a self-determining spirit, seeking the Highest and guided towards the Highest. Just because it is so vague a product of man's wavering desires and hopes and fears, and because it is so heterogeneous a thing, it is not possible to compare it as a whole with Christianity, or to forecast the process of its adjustment to a closer harmony with that faith. We can note, however, some aspects of its multifariousness by which it seeks to achieve that which it is the aim of religion to achieve, and which for that reason are the aspects of it that bring it nearest to Christianity.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Theology at its Best.

To many it will be good news that Herrmann's Outline of Dogmatic has at last been published.¹ This slender booklet, containing the paragraphs which he was accustomed to dictate to his classes before expanding them freely day by day in lecture, is the quintessence of his lifelong thought. And it is a book of rare worth. It might be seriously questioned, I think, whether anywhere in the world a hundred pages (priced at half a crown) could be found which set before us so clearly the essential

Christian convictions. Let us hope it will not have to wait long for a translator.

Herrmann, severe as his canons of thinking were, is really the theologian of the evangelist. He is perpetually saying to us that contact with Jesus Christ will give us all we need. Henry Drummond's meetings of thirty-five years ago and Herrmann's classroom at Marburg were different in a variety of ways, but the atmosphere was the same in both. It would have been quite natural for the lecturer to close, any given day, by announcing that an after-meeting would be held in a room upstairs. Conversions must often have taken place under his teaching.

¹ Wilhelm Herrmann, *Dogmatik* (F. A. Perthes, Stuttgart, 1925, pp. xxiv. 103. Mk. 2.50).

Dogmatic theology is here displayed as having two great functions. 'It has to show (1) how a man comes to be renewed inwardly by his experience of the power of Jesus, (2) how the faith expresses itself which is evoked and defined by this experience.' In accordance with this plan, which has all the simplicity of the master, Herrmann divides what he has to say into two parts. In Part I. he treats of Religion as such, in Part II. he expounds the believing convictions of evangelical Christianity.

It is fundamental with Herrmann that we cannot interpret moral life and the processes of nature by the same conceptions. In ethics an out-and-out Kantian, he holds that the practical certainty of freedom experienced by the morally mature man is beyond the jurisdiction of metaphysics; and the same is true of religion. Neither science, history, nor psychology can prove that religious faith is a *necessary* element of human life; if they could, it would be religion no longer. To be morally awake and in earnest is the vital pre-condition of understanding what the gospel is about. Acquaintance with good men and women, who call forth our trust, inevitably produces a sense of inability and guilt. All men lie under this painful weight of impotence—all, except those who have encountered in history a great fact which by its influence and meaning lifts us above the inward despair and gives victorious moral power. That fact is the fact of Jesus. For He, as a historic Person, comes to us as a revelation of the Power behind the moral law. He makes us sure of God as One who will not cast us out.

If it be asked precisely how Jesus reveals God, Herrmann replies that revelation is not an event in the remote past, but a personal experience now. Revelation is what happens when a man meets Christ and is changed by Him. The new certainty of God's forgiving love which springs up at the aspect of Jesus is the unveiling of the Father. In the Gospels, in the lives of redeemed men around us, we find ourselves face to face with Christ and know that in Him God is touching and saving us.

But how do I know that this Christ is real? No certainty that will bear the weight of our salvation can be gained, Herrmann never wearies of protesting, can be had by way of historical research. New Testament criticism is unable to furnish it. The truth is, we know Christ to be real because, and when, we are apprehended by the power of His inner life. Whatever may be uncertain

in the Synoptic tradition, the inner life of Jesus, round which that tradition gathers and which it illustrates on every side, has the power of attesting itself to the awakened conscience as an indubitable fact. It is an inner spiritual life that both reveals and realizes goodness perfectly; it exhibits an absolute trust in God's holiness and almighty love; it manifests a love that lifts up and consoles the sinner whom its holiness had covered with shame. This personality of Jesus, as the Evangelists picture Him, carries with it the proof of its own reality. We do not have to elaborate it by hard thinking; we have only to receive its impression, and deal sincerely with the absolute reverence and submission which it compels from us. In Jesus, God draws near our soul. Not as though we merely argued from Christ to God, as if they were separate and the distance between them had to be bridged by an inference; in Christ we find God personally present for our salvation. In what a man experiences at the hands of this Jesus, he has not merely an idea of God; he has the Living God Himself, working upon him. The man who has attained that is a Christian.

All the great Christian convictions are involved in this life-giving experience—the unity and transcendence of God, the true religious conception of the world, immortality, the awful gravity of sin, the indispensableness of the Cross, the Resurrection, the Godhead of Christ, the redeeming presence of God in His Spirit. They all emerge for the man who is bent as a sinner on taking Christ seriously—Christ, not as a figment of his own mind, but as presented to faith in Scripture.

The quality of the book before us is perhaps best conveyed by one or two extracts. 'Everything depends on whether we come to know the New Testament picture of Jesus, and find in Him the Power to which we are consciously made utterly subject in reverence and trust' (p. 29). 'The faith of which Jesus was thinking is both things: God's gift to us and at the same time a movement of our own obedience' (p. 30). 'Unbelief and self-seeking, and nothing else, are sin' (p. 64). 'Redemption is first and foremost a new creation of the faith in God which sin has destroyed; it takes shape in a conscious communion between God and us, mediated through the Redeemer' (p. 73). 'When we have found the forgiveness of God in the fact that Christ was given up for us, we know in experience that God's love is stronger than our guilt-

burdened heart' (p. 81). 'Our faith is at full strength only as the confidence arises in our own heart that Jesus is not one of the dead, but alive in the power of God' (p. 83). 'Our faith reaches its completion in the certainty that the mind and will of the living Jesus is ruling throughout the infinite Reality all about us' (p. 85).

It is an open question, no doubt, whether we can stop the process of theological reflection precisely at the boundary line which Herrmann draws; but at least he is a wise disciple of Christ who begins where Herrmann begins, and declines to neutralize the triumphant certainties which Herrmann spreads before us by any metaphysical conclusions for which the philosophical imagination rather than faith is responsible. There is something calming and uplifting in the sure and concentrated trust of this prophetic man.

The Introduction to the book consists in a graphic and worthy sketch, from the pen of Professor Rade, of the theological career of his friend and colleague.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

Deuteronomy and the Psalms.

To the *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, edited by Professor Sellin, Professor Eduard König has contributed the Commentary on Deuteronomy.¹ The Introduction discusses exhaustively questions of the text, origin, compositeness, unity, and spiritual value of Deuteronomy. Dr. König does not believe that metrical considerations ought to play any part in determining the text of such a book as this, nor does he think that the differences between the 'thou' and 'you' passages can be safely used as a criterion for the separation of the sources. The looseness or absence of connexion between contiguous passages shows that the book is composite, but just as certainly is there a real unity stamped upon it. The chief emphasis of Deuteronomy falls upon the unity of Jahweh, the centralization of the worship, the importance of the prophetic institution, the spiritual quality of true religion, and the religious duty of cultivating a humane spirit. The original Deuteronomy falls somewhere about 700 B.C.; it is connected in some

way with Hezekiah's attempt (the historicity of which Dr. König accepts) to reform the cult by the abolition of the high-places—a step which was very intelligible after the fall of the idolatrous northern kingdom in 722. The blend of prophetic and priestly interests which characterizes Deuteronomy goes back to the friendship of Isaiah and Uriah (Is 8²). The book represents the last step on the way from monolatry to monotheism. This commentary, while exhibiting on every page the finical scholarship to which Dr. König has long accustomed us, is also interested in the most lively way in the larger historical and literary problems, and, not least, in the religious value of the book.

In the same series appears Professor Volz's commentary on Jeremiah.² Its aim is not only to make a contribution to Old Testament science, but to be of genuine service to the religious life of the Church; and it is eminently fitted to be so, for its author writes with unfeigned enthusiasm for the character and achievement of the great prophet, whom he calls 'this glorious man,' and who exercised so profound an influence over the subsequent development of Hebrew religion, as expressed, e.g., in Job 3f., Ps 73, and Is 53. Every aspect of the work of Jeremiah receives the most intimate and sympathetic treatment, and there are special discussions at appropriate points dealing, for example, with the prophet's experience on the day of his call, his attitude to the cult and to Josiah's reformation, his imprecatory prayers, etc. To Volz, Jeremiah is not only the founder of personal religion, but perhaps the greatest poet of ancient Israel, and he confesses that the distress of the Great War and of the peace that followed it revealed to him the real power and significance of the prophet's words. He discusses with much lucidity the political significance of the Reformation of Josiah; its background is the waning power of Assyria, and its public demonstration of loyalty to Jahweh implied the tacit abandonment of Assyria and all her ways. Though Jeremiah did not directly participate in the reform, it embodied so many ideals that were dear to his heart that at first he must have welcomed it, especially as many of its supporters were among his own personal friends; but the later consequences of the reform led him to probe more deeply into the nature of true religion. The inner

¹ *Das Deuteronomium, eingeleitet, übersetzt, und erklärt von Eduard König* (Leipzig: Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung; pp. 248; Geh. Mk. 7.50; Geb. Mk. 8.50).

² *Der Prophet Jeremia, übersetzt und erklärt von D. Paul Volz* (Leipzig: Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung; pp. liii+445; Geh. Mk. 11; Geb. Mk. 13.50).

life of Jeremiah is strikingly portrayed—his ceaseless fight with his countrymen, with their religious leaders, with his God, and not least with himself. His literary activity was many-sided—he was orator, poet, diary-writer, and letter-writer; he is the connecting link between an orator like Amos and an author like Ezekiel or Deutero-Isaiah. One interesting feature of Volz's commentary is his sympathetic treatment of the later additions to the book: he makes us feel that they were added by men whose ambition was to apply the words of the prophet to the contemporary situation, and who conscientiously believed that their additions were also words of God. Introduction and commentary alike throw into vivid light the pathetic and heroic figure who was branded as a traitor, though he was the truest friend his country had.

Two highly original contributions to the study of the Psalter have been made by the Norwegian scholar, Sigmund Mowinckel, whose discussion of the 'Servant of Jahweh' songs was noticed in these columns some months ago. The first¹ is devoted to the consideration of the Psalms in which the word *inn* occurs. What is this 'iniquity,' and who are the 'workers of iniquity'? Many contexts describe them as men of lying tongues, who have the power to bring sickness upon other men, and to plunge them into ruin. An exhaustive examination of the relevant passages leads Mowinckel to the conclusion that *inn* is magic, and that the workers of *inn* are magicians. This would explain many things—the vagueness of the enemies so frequently referred to (unknown, in many cases, to the Psalmist himself) and the fact that the sick man frequently prays to be delivered from them rather than from his sickness (the one of course would involve the other). It would also explain the fierce temper of the imprecatory psalms; for the demons, or the magicians who were in league with them, were in fundamental opposition to the God of Israel—magic and all such practices being sternly proscribed by a resolutely uncompromising Jahwism. Mowinckel throws out the interesting suggestion that primarily *inn* may be the same as the differently pointed *inn* (vigour, wealth): it was the mysterious power wielded by the magicians, and, as wielded by them, it worked for evil. He carries this interpretation into Psalms like 37, 49,

and 73, which have usually been regarded as dealing with the problem of theodicy, and regards these psalms as prayers by sick men for deliverance from the godless, who are magicians. The 'whisperings' in Ps 41⁷ are the incantations or spells by which such men seek to accomplish their nefarious ends. In a concluding chapter, Mowinckel argues that such an interpretation of these Psalms would be in no way derogatory to their religious value, as the enemies of the psalmists would be essentially spiritual enemies, and trust in Jahweh lifted them to triumph over the horrors of the demon-world. This trust receives its classic expression in Ps 91.

The second of Mowinckel's studies in the Psalter² deals with the Psalms which exalt Jahweh as King, or as entering upon His reign (47, 93, 95-100), but his elaborate discussion embraces practically the whole Psalter, and much of prophecy as well. It has been the custom to interpret these psalms either historically, as relating to some particular event, or eschatologically. Mowinckel thinks that these methods are both wrong; on the analogy of the Babylonian cult, he believes that they were written for the New Year's festival, the feast of tabernacles, to celebrate the (annual) accession of Jahweh to His throne. This suggestion throws a flood of light, e.g., on Ps 47^{5f}: 'God is gone up with a shout; sing praise unto our King.' His kingship is founded on His power displayed in Creation, and in His victory over the primeval dragons: that accounts for the frequent allusion to these things in the relevant psalms, and many a passage in Deutero-Isaiah moves in the same circle of ideas (though in Deutero-Isaiah they are not organically connected), so that some at any rate of the psalms in question are certainly pre-exilic. In time the mythical enemy over whom Jahweh triumphed became first Egypt and then the nations generally, as in Ps 46. To ancient Israel the kingdom of God was not primarily an eschatological but a present magnitude. In Part II. it is very skilfully argued that the roots of Hebrew eschatology are to be found in this festival, celebrating the accession of Jahweh to His throne: Mowinckel was led to this highly important and suggestive conclusion by noting the extraordinary similarity between the features of the eschatological picture and those of the cult-myth underlying the accession

² *Psalmestudien II. Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie* (Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad; pp. 347).

¹ *Psalmestudien I. Āwān und die Individuellen Klegepsalmen* (Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad; pp. 181).

psalms. The grim realities of experience gradually pushed the hopes kindled by the New Year's festival out upon the future. This is a volume which can hardly fail to exercise a profound influence on future discussion, whether of the Psalter or of Eschatology.

A number of Professor Gunkel's old pupils and friends commemorated his sixtieth birthday, by presenting him with a series of essays¹ on various O.T. and N.T. problems. Together they constitute a noble tribute to a scholar whose work has been fruitful and stimulating beyond most. Most of the essays are written by experts for experts. The first part (pp. 425) contains, among other things, discussions of the Joseph and Jacob stories, of Moses and the Decalogue, of the ark, of Hebrew narrative style, of the sources and redaction of the Book of Kings, of the Cyrus songs in Deutero-Isaiah, of the Holy Spirit in the Gathas, and of the dirge for the dead in modern Egypt (Arabic text with German translation and notes). The second part (pp. 240) deals with the Fourth Gospel (one essay with its style, another with the historical background of the Prologue): also with Acts, the later Christian Apocalyptic, and the place of the Gospels in the general history of literature (the last a singularly fresh and informing discussion). As it would be impossible to give in a few words even a faint idea of the rich fare provided by these scholarly papers, special attention may be called to two of more general interest—that of Emil Balla (in Part I.), on *The Problem of Suffering in the Religion of Israel and Judah*, and that of Bruno Violet (in Part II.), on *The 'Cursing' of the Fig-tree*.

For early Israel there was strictly no problem of suffering. Doubtless suffering could often be regarded as punishment for a breach of the moral or the ritual order, but often Jahweh seemed to act capriciously. It was the prophets who created the problem by insisting that He was always and absolutely just: this, too, is the conception that dominated Deuteronomy, and it had an enormous influence on later Judaism. Doubts are raised by the sufferings of the innocent, but it is frankly admitted in Job that in the last analysis God is in-

comprehensible. The noblest solution is in Ps 73—in the uninterrupted fellowship of the sufferer with his God. Violet argues that Mk 11¹⁴ (cf. Mt 21¹⁹) originally ran, 'The son of man (*i.e.* Jesus Himself) will never eat thy fruit again' (cf. Mk 14²⁵). This would relieve Jesus of the charge of having cursed an innocent tree, and the commentators from the obligation to explain that curse away.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Professor Strohl on Luther.²

A WRITER on the Reformation period who happens to be one of a small Protestant minority amid a large Romanist majority is exposed to one or other of two temptations, either of which, if yielded to, makes the value of his work matter of doubt. He may be so narrow-minded that he is a mere zealot, more interested in propaganda than in strict historical truth. Or he may be so broad-minded that he is no better than a mere trimmer, ready to cry 'Peace' where there is no peace. Professor Strohl is neither zealot nor trimmer. First and last he is fair-minded. He is not a controversialist primarily concerned with propaganda. He is a historian earnestly devoted to truth. Perfect impartiality in a historian is no doubt a *desideratum* unrealized and unrealizable; but our author gives the impression of having attained it as nearly as can be claimed for any.

In this work he continues that penetrating and brilliant study of Luther's thought of which we had an instalment in *L'Évolution religieuse de Luther jusqu'en 1515*. This is a larger volume although it deals with only some five years. For the development of Luther's mind the period 1515-1520 is all-important; just how important, a perusal of this book will make perfectly clear. By 1520 Lutheranism was full-grown, it had attained, in Professor Strohl's phrase, its apogee. The essential doctrines of Justification, of Church and of Sacrament, and the Manifesto of Reform which touched all human activities, had then received the best statements of them that Luther reached. Contradictions and hesitations which are easily discernible up to 1515 have now all but

² *L'Epanouissement de la Pensée Religieuse de Luther de 1515 à 1520*, par Henri Strohl, Docteur en Théologie (Librairie Istra, Strasbourg; broch. pp. 424; 18 fr.).

¹ *Εὐχαριστίαι Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstag, dem 23 Mai 1922 dargebracht von seinen Schülern und Freunden*, 2 Teile (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht; Geh. 30.18; Geb. 33.20).

disappeared. There is still some confusion in the concept of Faith; but, on the whole, contradictions, instead of staring us in the face, have now to be painfully searched for.

The richness of this scholarly masterpiece cannot be represented within our space-limits. It may simply be said that the conviction will be developed in the mind of the candid reader that in Professor Strohl we have, if not *the* authority upon Luther, certainly one of whose work no student of the achievement of the great reformer can afford to be ignorant.

The author impresses one, not only by his massive scholarship and his grasp and use of sound historical method, but by the shrewdness of his psychological insight. Luther possessed, if one may use the affected term, an 'intriguing' personality, which combined indisputable greatness and originality with a certain lack of logic, so that now and then he harked back for no very apparent reason to the very 'authority' and 'tradition' from which he was striving to vindicate his freedom. Why, for example, did he favour that consubstantiation which to many may well seem more unintelligible

and untenable than the transubstantiation which he rejected? On this, as on not a few as difficult questions, Professor Strohl gives as satisfying an answer as can be hoped for.

The author makes it clear time and again, as he did in his former volume, that for the understanding of Luther we have often to go back a long way in the history of thought. Such resumé of previous opinion, for example, on penitence or indulgences, are masterly and most impressive. We all know that St. Paul was Luther's greatest teacher, and how profound was the influence of Augustine and of mystics like Tauler. Few, however, will not own themselves debtor to Professor Strohl for his exposition of the ways in which they combined to shape Luther's thought; and still more for his revelation of what is not so generally familiar, the influence on his mind of the Schoolmen.

It is much to be desired that this valuable work should be made widely useful in our own country and in America by being afforded an English translation.

W. D. NIVEN.

Aberdeen.

Contributions and Comments.

'The Sun standing still' (Joshua x. 6-14).

IN offering an interpretation of this much-discussed passage, let me say that I myself have been over the ground and know what I am talking about, while my familiarity with the Arabic language, gained during a stay of nearly thirty-two years in Arabia, fits me for discussing the point; as Arabic, like Hebrew, is a trilateral language derived from the same stock; and, consequently, when there is any doubt about the meaning of a Hebrew word, light can often be obtained by discovering its root meaning in Syriac and Arabic.

Now the story goes that Joshua's army was lying at a place called Gilgal, nearly twenty miles east of Gibeon, when messengers came from that city to implore his aid in saving the town. Joshua appears to have acted at once, for we read that he went up from Gilgal all night. But surely no

leader would take his army through those rocky defiles and along those dangerous steepes without reconnoitring the road and sending out scouts to make sure that the road was clear; but scouts are only of service when they have sufficient light for searching not only the road, but also its environments, as otherwise they may lead the whole army into an ambushade. Consequently common sense would teach us, even though the narrative had said nothing about it, that the moon must have been nearly full when Joshua made his famous march to raise the siege of Gibeon. Secure in the thought that Joshua's army was twenty miles off, these five kings never dreamed of guarding the road to Gilgal; so we read that 'Joshua came upon them suddenly,' and that he chased the panic-stricken army of these five kings along the road to Beth-horon, which is, practically speaking, due west of Gibeon. But, while Joshua was following the foe, he saw that the moon, which had been of so much service to the Israelites in their march, was

beginning to set in Ajalon, due west of where Joshua was at the time, and that the sun was just about to rise over Gibeon in the east—and as he knew that even the most panic-stricken army, that has lost all reasoning power in the dark, will rally, when sufficient light is given to it to see the danger, and distinguish friend from foe; and knowing also that after their long and tiresome march of over twenty miles his men could not have the resisting power of the enemy that had been refreshed by a long night's rest, Joshua called upon the Lord to help the Israelites in such a way that neither the effects of the surprise attack would be lost on the foe, nor the superstitious fears of those Canaanites be removed, so he cried: 'Sun be silent (see margins of Bibles) over Gibeon (in the east), and thou moon in the valley of Ajalon (in the west).'

This is the only place in the Bible where the Hebrew word *dāmam* is translated 'stand still,' and it is a meaning which cannot be justified either in Hebrew or in any other trilateral language. Its real meaning is 'cease' or 'be silent' (see La 2¹⁸, Job 29²¹, and Am 5¹³).

But, if one tells a light to cease or be silent, what other meaning can be attached to the phrase than 'Do not shine'? So we read, 'The sun was silent, and the moon set.' For the Hebrew word *āmāḏ*, which in the A.V. has been translated 'stayed,' means 'to sink or dip,' 'to set or decline.' Most lexicographers give this meaning to the word, although they add that, in this sense, it has become obsolete in Hebrew, though found in Arabic. None of these lexicographers tells us when this meaning for the word became obsolete, but most assuredly it was not before Ezekiel was written. In Arabic, however, the word means 'to dip,' 'to immerse,' 'to obscure,' and it is from this word that John the Baptist got the agnomen 'Baptist.'

The narrative, however, goes on to ask: 'Is it not written in the book of Jashar that the sun was silent in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to come out for the space of a whole day?' The verb *bāḏ*, translated 'go down' in the A.V., is a verb that is used nearly three thousand times in the Bible, yet it is only twelve times translated 'go down' and even in three of these passages Jos 10¹³, Jer 15⁹, and Mic 3⁹, it is evidently a mistranslation; for, though the sun could be covered or eclipsed, it could not 'go down' and let the day remain.

The real meaning of the word *bāḏ* is 'to come or

go,' in the widest sense of these words 'to come in or go in'; 'to come out or go out'; consequently I translate the passage: 'Sun, be silent over Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon; so the sun was silent, and the moon set, while the people avenged themselves on their enemies. Is it not written in the book of Jashar: the sun was silent in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to come out for the space of a whole day,' i.e. till sunrise next morning.

When, however, we ask how this phenomenon was produced, we find the answer in the narrative itself; for we read (Jos 10¹¹): 'And it came to pass, as they fled from before Israel, and were in the going down to Beth-horon, that the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died: and they which died from the hailstones were more than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword.'

Now, from what I have said, you will perceive that though the Lord did miraculously help the children of Israel by making the Canaanites' confusion worse confounded by means of a hailstorm, which both exacted a heavy toll from the enemy and increased their fears, there is no question of heaping miracle upon miracle or of upsetting the whole course of nature.

The meaning of the passage is clear, and I think that we most honour God who use our reasoning powers, and firmly believe that God spake truth when He said (Gn 8²²), that 'day and night shall not cease.'

JOHN C. YOUNG.

Aden.

בָּרִיר אֶבֶן בְּמִרְיָמָה (Proverbs xxi. 8).¹

THE various renderings of the first hemistich of this proverb, none of which seems altogether satisfactory, appear to point to a defective or faulty MS. reading. R.V.'s rendering:

As a bag of gems in a heap of stones,
So is he that giveth honour to a fool,

may be compared with the proverbial expression (Mt 7⁶) of 'casting pearls before swine,' but the correspondence is not very close, more especially

¹ This note was received before the Rev. W. G. Robertson's note on the same passage appeared in the June number.—EDITOR.

with the second hemistich, 'lest they (the swine) turn upon and rend you.' In the margin, R.V. agrees with A.V., 'As one that bindeth fast a stone in a sling,' which is also the rendering of the LXX.

Rather curious is that of Jerome, 'Like one who throws a stone on the back of Mercury,' as if he read מרדך or מרדוך (Merodach or Mardûk, the supreme Babylonian god whose symbol was Jupiter or Mercury) for מרומה ('heap of stones,' or 'sling'). This latter word appears to be ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, the root being רָנַם ('to pile up' or 'cast stones'). Strange as may seem to us the cult of worshipping a god by throwing stones at him, the practice was not unusual among the Jews, as the Talmud testifies.

צָרַר may be taken as participial of צָרַר ('to wrap up'), or as a noun ('bundle' or 'bag') from the same root. Followed by בָּ, the verb is almost invariably translated, 'bind up,' 'wrap up in a cloth or bundle' (cf. Ex 12³⁴, Is 8¹⁶, Pr 30⁴). אֶבֶן, by itself, without qualification, does not appear to bear the meaning 'gem.' 'Stones of beryl' (Ex 28⁹), 'stones of delight or preciousness,' 'hail stones' (Is 30³⁰), and similar combinations are frequently met with; but I am unable to find a passage where the word, standing alone, carries indisputably the meaning of precious stone or gem.

In the rendering of R.V. the two hemistichs do not quite correspond. After 'a bag of gems' (inanimate), we should expect the corresponding hemistich to be also of things inanimate, in accordance with the general rule of 'Proverbs.' As instances may be cited:

The heart of him that hath understanding seeketh knowledge

But the mouth of fools feedeth on folly,

and the oft quoted:

Better a dinner of herbs where love is,
Than a stalled ox and hatred therewith.

A.V.'s rendering (with the LXX) seems somewhat feeble. To 'bind fast a stone in a sling,' and to 'give honour to a fool,' are both senseless actions indeed, but there the comparison ends.

I would therefore venture to suggest for מְרַמָּה of the text אֶרְמָן ('purple'):

As one wrapping (tricking out) a stone in purple,
So is he who doeth honour to a fool.

Purple (the robe of honour) would thus correspond with 'honour' in the second hemistich. Doing honour to a fool (בָּסִיל, often with the sense also of impiety) is like tricking out, as though worthy of honour, a senseless stone (fetish). Compare Is 57⁶, 'In the smooth polished stones of the wady; yea, in these, even these, are your portion and lot: even to them do ye pour out drink-offerings and present meat-offerings.' Fetish stones, like trees, were sometimes draped with pieces of cloth.

Taking the Hebrew text as it stands, it might also be translated:

As one who wraps (places carefully) a stone in
a heap of stones,
So is he who doeth honour to Orion.

W. D. MORRIS.

Kelso.

The Lord's Supper.

WHAT was Christ's intention in partaking of the Last Supper with His disciples? Had it any relation to sacrifice in historic Judaism and through that to the universal search for union through sacrifice? Was there here the intention to gather up all the past and re-create it, and show forth the substance of which these things were but the shadows? Did He intend that His disciples should so understand it and ever feel that here was a sacramental meal, a communion, which was at once the end and the beginning, the Omega and the Alpha?

To all this the Catholic faith, the Evangelical faith, has always replied eagerly in the affirmative. In some form or another it sees in Christ's death the source and centre of its life, and in the Last Supper sees Christ's own explanation of the significance of the Cross. A grave challenge is, however, being offered to this view. It is being said that the text on which these beliefs are based is incorrect. It is true that Paul says, in 1 Co 10¹⁶, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?' and in 1 Co 11²⁵ quotes Jesus as saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood' (so substantially with Matthew and Mark). But to the modernist of a certain type all that is not good enough. The question is, What has Luke, and he in the Western text, to say? By your leave or without it, we are told, we must put aside all else but this.

Supposing we do accept, for the moment, as settled what is most certainly quite unsettled, and

declare for the Western text every time, whither, at the worst, are we led?

We are led to this. All accounts of the Last Supper that are worth considering agree in saying, 'This is my body.' Let us omit the twentieth verse in Lk 22, 'Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood which is shed for you,' and all of the nineteenth verse after the word body, *i.e.* the words 'which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.' Let us remove from association with the cup all words defining its purpose. Let us, in short, take the accounts on the most meagre basis to which on any even remotely reasonable proposition we might be reduced and, with the Western Text and some of the old Latin MSS., insist on all these omissions and we still have three definite facts on which to form our conclusions.

First, we have a meal of fellowship. Second, a meal of fellowship at which Jesus on the eve of death as He knows, breaking and sharing the loaf, says, 'This is my body.' Third, such a feast associated in reference and in time with the Passover (that night or the next).

Supposing, for the sake of argument, that one

admits, as I do not, that this was all, it is so much that it carries with it the rest as a matter of inevitable sequence.

How could it possibly occur otherwise than that, looking back, all the sacred sacrificial significance of the past should be gathered up and made perfect here? If Jesus wished it to be so understood, He took the most definite steps to that end. If He did not wish it, and this was merely a gathering of friends, however intimate, solemn, and beautiful the occasion, He showed a lack of insight, and a carelessness to what kind of wrong associations might gather round these last sacred hours, round this ultimate act of His earthly life, in the memory of His disciples and in the future of the Kingdom, so incompatible with all else in Jesus that—apart from the indecency we feel at associating Him with such spiritual clumsiness—they must on historical grounds be instantly rejected.

It seems safe, then, to say that in making the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the central act of its worship and communion the Christian Church is truly interpreting the intention of our Lord.

INNES LOGAN.

Cambridge.

Entre Nous.

The Inclusive Sacrifice.

It is well that all that the late Dr. Jowett wrote should be preserved in book form. *Life in the Heights* is a volume of short studies in the Epistles, and it has been issued by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (5s. net). We shall quote from his meditation on 'They first gave their own selves unto the Lord.'

'The healthy spiritual life is not so much a procession of sacrifices as a spirit of inclusive consecration. The queen bee has winged her flight in a certain direction and the entire swarm is in her train. I think this must be the meaning of a sentence in a letter which was found in the pocket of a French sergeant who was found dead on the battlefield of the Marne. The letter is written to his parents, and this is the sentence: "You know how I had made the sacrifice of my life before leaving." . . .

'Now this is the secret of the Christian life, to make the inclusive sacrifice. Religious life is inevitably tedious when it consists of a conscious yielding of our smaller things and a withholding of our central strength. It is one thing to surrender individual pounds; it is quite another thing to consecrate our wealth. It is one thing to build altars here and there on the road; it is quite another thing to consecrate the journey. It is one thing to be religious in spasmodic conflicts, but it is quite another thing to hallow the entire campaign. If our self is kept back from the Lord, our religion will be a procession of reluctances and irritations. Every circumstance will present a separate problem instead of being caught up in the sweep of a mighty consecration. And that is the trouble with a great many people. They try to be religious in smaller surrenders, while the great surrender has never been made. And these smaller

surrenders encounter curbs and restraints, and the soul is annoyed and discordant. The large surrender brings us into God's large place. We pass into the glorious freedom of God's children, and His statutes become our songs.'

Suggestion.

Miss Amy Carmichael has again given us in *Mimosa* (Diocesan Press, Madras; 2s. 9d.; procurable in this country from Mrs. Streeter, 41 High Street, Oxford), a vivid picture of girlhood in Southern India. It is a true story, and the author makes it living to us by her wonderful word-painting and intensity of feeling. We see *Mimosa* alone in that heathen village struggling with caste, and all that it involves of coercion and the cutting of family ties. How she worked out her salvation there, so beautifully and courageously, is the subject of this fascinating story. She is still working in her bigoted Hindu village, and we have not yet got the last chapter.

We take these from the book: 'There was a wizard worshipping at the waterfall that year, and he gave *Mimosa's* husband a magic medicine. It was a black, inky, sticky substance wrapped in a leaf. Said the wizard, "Take a third portion of this medicine once a day for three successive days with a small part of the leaf. For forty days thereafter take only food cooked in a new earthen vessel and served from the pot with a newly-made wooden ladle. On the fortieth day thy sight will be restored." And it was so. *Mimosa's* husband returned quite well. India is the home of suggestion and of auto-suggestion.'

Suffering.

"Wilt Thou be indeed to me as waters that fail?" Did her heart cry that at this hour?

"I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not."

He had never heard the words, knew nothing of the truth that reinforces our fainting spirits. But wonderful, wonderful are the ways of the Lord. He is here, sometimes revealed to us, sometimes hidden, but always a God at hand and not a God far off: near at that moment was the Lover of souls.

"Have I been a wilderness unto thee?"

"Then with a warm glow of joy she knew what He had been to her all through the bitter years. "You know Him by learning," she said one day to Star, her sister, "but I know Him by suffering."

'Your Light.'

'I suppose that you have noticed from Lew Down or any height, in the morning and in the evening, how that the sun is reflected by some window in—it may be a mansion, it may be a cottage, far away, and how that it sends a burning ray a distance of many a mile.

'During the South African war, pieces of looking-glass were employed to send messages by flashes of the sun. One wink stood for A, two for E, and so on. This was called a Heliograph. In my text to-day, Our Lord as much as bids His servants be Heliographs. Send messages about you of love, trust, and worship of God, the Everlasting Father.

'Now this is deserving of notice, that no window can send a flash of light that does not at the same time admit the light into the chamber which it is set to illumine. It sends forth the brilliant ray, *because it has received* the sunbeam into the very room in the wall of which it is set.'

This is from a small volume of sermons, kindly and simple, but full of the presence of God. They were preached by the late Rev. S. Baring-Gould, M.A., Rector of Lew Trenchard, in his extreme old age. The title is *My Few Last Words* (Skeffingtons; 3s. net).

A Revival.

The Dog-Watch Meetings (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net) is a remarkable story of a revival among the members of the crew of a tramp steamer, told by the third engineer, Alexander Stewart. From the beginning Mr. Stewart's narrative grips the interest of the reader and holds it by the realistic pictures we get of life at sea and of the sailor's life in foreign seaports as far apart as the ports of Norway and Finland are from those of Brazil, or as Burmah is from South America. The writer was converted as an apprentice engineer, but he found on going to sea that among his shipmates, from the captain to the donkeyman, religion was a subject tabooed, and that Sunday as a day of religious observance is almost unknown on board the trading ship. He writes of conditions as they were several years ago on board a well-equipped 'tramp,' but he says that during the intervening years the conditions of life among the crew on board such ships have changed little. He had at once to settle for himself, was he to read his Bible, to say his prayers, to hold by his religious convictions,

or was he to do as his comrades were accustomed to do? His conversion proved a reality, and the complete story of the religious influence gradually exercised over one man and another until almost the entire crew were won over reads like a romance of the sea in which the adventures are of a quite exceptional character.

The Duty of Thought.

"On these things, think." "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." That is the word: Think! The Christian duty of using our intellects is one to which far too little attention has been given. And, whatever may have been the case in past ages, it is a duty peculiarly incumbent upon us in the times in which we now live. For the Christian teacher and the Christian believer are confronted by problems which they cannot shirk if the Christian view of life is to remain a real force in the affairs of men; and these problems they cannot wisely deal with without thought—thought protracted, thought consecutive, thought sometimes even distasteful. . . .

'Has it ever occurred to you that in the New Testament "the Will of God" is most commonly brought before us, not as something we are simply to submit to, but as something we are actively to do? The point of view from which most of the New Testament is written is that a Heavenly Father has a purpose for us which He can only carry out by our help. There is moral and physical evil in the world—that we have got to recognize, however it came there; and it helps us little to philosophize about it. I do not expect men will ever find in this life an explanation of evil which will entirely satisfy their hearts as well as their minds. Our more practical business is not to explain evil, but to overcome it. And it is the characteristic of the religion of Christ that it does not—like so much Oriental religion—call upon us merely to submit and bow the head before untoward outward happenings—murmuring "Kismet," or "Thy Will be done," in a spirit of unintelligent fatalism. We have got to use our reason, to discriminate, to judge which among our troubles can be in accordance with the Will of a Heavenly Father.

'Our Master said emphatically about the little children around Him—thinking, it may be, of the ruin which was about to befall the Jewish people and the horrors of war—"It is not the will of your Heavenly Father that one of these little ones should perish." It is not His Will that the little children around us should suffer from any preventable evil.

And what are we all but children of a larger growth?

'There is a phrase of Bishop Wilson's which Matthew Arnold was fond of quoting. Our duty, said Wilson, is "to make reason and the Will of God prevail"; that is, reason *is* the Will of God. And that brings me back to my starting-point. We have got to employ our intellects to find out the Will of God and to discover the means for its realization. "I beseech you, brethren," says Paul, writing to the Church at Rome, "that ye be transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect Will of God." King James' version hardly brings out Paul's meaning: to "prove" sounds like the finding of reasons for that of which we are already informed. What is generally recognized as the best modern English version gives the exhortation thus: "Have your mind renewed, and so be . . . able to make out what the Will of God is—namely, what is good and acceptable to Him, and perfect." That which, using the best judgment we have, we find to be "good"; that which, in the words of my text, we can recognize—it may be only after much anxious thought—to be "true" and "honest" and "just" and "pure" and "lovely," that is the Will of God.'

Sermons of an Economist.

The previous paragraph is quoted from an address delivered in 1922 in Birmingham Cathedral by Sir William J. Ashley, Vice-Principal of the University of Birmingham, and Professor of Commerce in that University since 1901. He has written a number of works bearing on economic problems, and several of these are regarded as the standard work on the particular subject. From time to time Sir William Ashley has been invited to speak from the pulpit, and Messrs. Longmans have now collected seven of his sermons and two addresses, and have published them as a small volume with the title *The Christian Outlook* (4s. 6d. net). The author 'has taken the opportunity,' we are told, 'to try to put into words what he regards as the Christian attitude towards life, especially in its bearing on modern economic and social questions.' We welcome these sermons by a layman and by an economic expert. They are full of thought and throw considerable light on present industrial problems, and there is no doubt that they will stimulate the thought of others. A small volume, but one which should be bought.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.